

LIBRARY ROOM
LIBRARY
UNIV. OF MICH.

OCT 9 1931

VOLUME XVII

NUMBER 6

BULLETIN
OF THE
AMERICAN ASSOCIATION
OF
UNIVERSITY PROFESSORS

ANNUAL MEETING
OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY

OCTOBER, 1931

OFFICERS OF THE ASSOCIATION FOR 1931

PRESIDENT

W. B. MUNRO¹ (*Government*) California Institute of Technology

VICE-PRESIDENTS

HARDIN CRAIG (*English*) Stanford University
J. S. GUY (*Chemistry*) Emory University

GENERAL SECRETARY

H. W. TYLER¹ (*Mathematics*) Mass. Institute of Technology

TREASURER AND EXECUTIVE SECRETARY

JOSEPH MAYER¹ (*Economics*) Tufts College

MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL

For term ending December 31, 1931

B. H. BODE (<i>Philosophy</i>)	Ohio State University
M. T. BOGERT ¹ (<i>Chemistry</i>)	Columbia University
A. L. BONDURANT (<i>Classics</i>)	University of Mississippi
H. S. CONARD (<i>Botany</i>)	Grinnell College
H. G. DOYLE ¹ (<i>Romance Languages</i>)	George Washington University
P. O. RAY (<i>Political Science</i>)	University of California (Berkeley)
F. K. RICHTMEYER (<i>Physics</i>)	Cornell University
JOEL STEBBINS (<i>Astronomy</i>)	University of Wisconsin
H. S. WHITE (<i>Mathematics</i>)	Vassar College
H. V. WILSON (<i>Biology</i>)	University of North Carolina

For term ending December 31, 1932

J. H. BREASTED (<i>Egyptology</i>)	University of Chicago
J. P. W. CRAWFORD (<i>Romance Languages</i>)	University of Pennsylvania
G. W. CUNNINGHAM (<i>Philosophy</i>)	Cornell University
PAUL EMERSON (<i>Agriculture</i>)	Iowa State University
YANDELL HENDERSON ¹ (<i>Physiology</i>)	Yale University
L. L. HENDREN (<i>Physics</i>)	University of Georgia
BUFORD JOHNSON ¹ (<i>Psychology</i>)	Johns Hopkins University
F. L. PAXSON (<i>History</i>)	University of Wisconsin
LOUISE POUND (<i>English</i>)	University of Nebraska
B. J. VOS (<i>German</i>)	Indiana University

For term ending December 31, 1933

DINSMORE ALTER (<i>Astronomy</i>)	University of Kansas
WILLIAM ANDERSON (<i>Government</i>)	University of Minnesota
O. J. CAMPBELL ¹ (<i>English</i>)	University of Michigan
GRACE A. DELAGUNA (<i>Philosophy</i>)	Bryn Mawr College
H. L. DODGE (<i>Physics</i>)	University of Oklahoma
M. J. ELROD (<i>Natural Science</i>)	University of Montana
O. MANTHEY-ZORN (<i>German</i>)	Amherst College
L. B. RICHARDSON ¹ (<i>Chemistry</i>)	Dartmouth College
R. E. TURNER (<i>History</i>)	University of Pittsburgh
H. B. YOCOM (<i>Zoology</i>)	University of Oregon

Ex-officio (until end of year noted)

W. T. SEMPLE (<i>Classics</i>) (1932)	University of Cincinnati
HENRY CREW (<i>Physics</i>) (1934)	Northwestern University

¹ Members of the Executive Committee

VOLUME XVII

OCTOBER, 1931

NUMBER 6

BULLETIN
OF
THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION
OF UNIVERSITY PROFESSORS

ANNUAL MEETING
OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY

PUBLISHED BY
THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF UNIVERSITY PROFESSORS
20TH AND NORTHAMPTON STS., EASTON, PA.

EDITORIAL COMMITTEE: JOSEPH ALLEN; PAUL KAUFMAN;
JOSEPH MAYER; H. W. TYLER, *Chairman*

744 JACKSON PLACE
WASHINGTON, D. C.

Issued monthly except in June, July, August, and September

Entered as Second-class matter, April 24, 1922, at the Post Office at
Easton, Pa., under the act of August 24, 1912.

Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103,
Act of October 3, 1917, authorized on September 13, 1918.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Editorial Note.....	434
Notes and Announcements	
Annual Meeting.....	435
Report of Committee to Nominate Officers.....	436
Association of Medical Colleges.....	437
Social Science Research Council, Fellowships.....	440
Rhodes Scholarships.....	441
Journal of Higher Education.....	442
Engineering Education.....	442
American Map Company.....	442
Academic Freedom and Tenure	
Ohio State University.....	443
Local and Chapter Notes	
University of Buffalo, New Curriculum.....	474
Columbia University, Athletic Policies.....	475
M. I. T., Comprehensive Examinations in Electrical Engineering.....	476
University of Oklahoma, Chapter Activities.....	478
University of Oregon, Group Insurance.....	478
Tulane University, Health Education.....	480
Communications	
Professorial Efficiency and the Sliding Salary Scale.....	482
A Problem of Tenure:	
From a College President.....	483
Reply from the Secretary of the Association.....	483
Membership	
Members Elected.....	485
Nominations for Membership.....	490

Appointment Service Announcements

Vacancies Reported.....	497
Civil Service Announcement.....	497
Teachers Available.....	498

Contents of previous issues of the *Bulletin* of the Association of University Professors may be found by consulting the EDUCATION INDEX.

EDITORIAL NOTE

The first issue this fall is noteworthy in the presentation of one of the most important reports ever submitted by the Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure. Few cases involving the principles of freedom and tenure have aroused so much widespread comment within recent years as the dismissal of Professor Miller at Ohio State University. The fundamental policies of a large university are laid open to profound questioning. The issues of academic freedom and security of academic tenure stand clear from any obscuring problem of forced economy in hard times. Since the charges alleged were directed against a professor's teachings in the field of racial relations and against his activities in foreign countries, the case commands exceptional public interest, national, and even international.

The essentials of the findings and conclusions were released to the press of the country on August 10. That the final complete report may be printed in the present issue of the *Bulletin* within our fixed limitations of space, the regular departments of Reviews and Educational Discussion have been held over until November.

In connection with this report particular attention may be called to the communications in this issue, as indicating full recognition by the Association of the point of view of institutional administrations and governing boards.

NOTES AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

ANNUAL MEETING

The annual meeting of the Association will be held at Chicago Friday and Saturday, November 27 and 28. The first session will be held on Friday at 2:00 P. M., the annual dinner Friday at 7:00 P. M., at which President Hutchins of the University of Chicago will be the guest of honor and speaker; further sessions of the Association Saturday at 10:00 A. M. and at 2:00 P. M. A meeting of the Council will be held Friday evening with an adjourned session Saturday afternoon. This meeting, held independently of the larger groups with which we ordinarily make combinations, is essentially a delegate meeting of the Association for undivided attention to its business. It will be recalled that a meeting of this kind was held some years ago at Columbus at the corresponding date and that a general desire was expressed for repetition at more or less regular intervals. Last year it seemed financially impracticable to repeat the experiment, but with the increased income it becomes feasible.

In order to facilitate the attendance of representatives of as many chapters as possible, provision has been made for reimbursing transportation to a certain definite extent, which will be explained to chapters affected. It is also desired in a meeting of this kind that a liberal allowance of time should be made for discussion rather than for formal addresses and committee reports. The session on Friday afternoon will, therefore, be devoted to whatever extent may be necessary to proposals and recommendations from chapters and to discussion of the plans and policies of the Association. It is particularly requested for the success of this part of the program, however, that the office receive notification in advance of topics and questions to be presented in order that due preparation may be made and in order that the program to be published in the November *Bulletin* may be as complete as possible.

At the present time, preliminary arrangements have been made on the program as follows:

Friday, 2 P. M. Academic Freedom Problems of the Year and the Study of College and University Tenure. The unprecedented amount of business of the year, culminating in the remarkable Miller case at Ohio State University, presents much matter for the careful consideration of the Association, and the preliminary report of the Tenure investigation is closely related.

Friday evening. Annual Dinner. President Hutchins of the University of Chicago and other speakers of distinction will address the Association.

Saturday A. M. The general topic will be College Teaching with special reference to methods of judging and improving it. This is a natural sequel of the discussions at North Carolina and Cleveland. Speakers will be announced.

Saturday P. M. General Business including the reports of Officers and Committees.

Chapters may appoint any number of delegates subject to the expense arrangements indicated in the October chapter letter, and general attendance of members from nearby institutions is particularly desired.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE TO NOMINATE OFFICERS

For President (for two years), Walter Wheeler Cook, Law, Johns Hopkins.

For Vice-President, E. G. Conklin, Biology, Princeton.

For Vice-President, F. K. Richtmyer, Physics, Cornell.

For General Secretary, H. W. Tyler, Mathematics, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

Members of the Council (term expiring January 1, 1934).

R. A. Budington, Zoology, Oberlin.

Barry Cerf, Romance Languages, Reed.

F. W. Coker, Political Science, Yale.

Marian E. Hubbard, Zoology, Wellesley.

G. F. Reynolds, English, Colorado.

W. J. Robbins, Botany, Missouri.

Thorndike Saville, Engineering, North Carolina.

L. M. Terman, Psychology, Stanford.

Oswald Veblen, Mathematics, Princeton.

Carl Wittke, History, Ohio State.

CHANGES OF ADDRESS

Prompt notice in change of address is requested. Notification must be received by November 15 to be included in the January *Bulletin*.

ASSOCIATION OF MEDICAL COLLEGES¹

Dr. Willard C. Rappleye, who directed the studies of the Commission on Medical Education, organized in 1925 by the Association of American Medical Colleges, has prepared a chapter on medical education for the Biennial Survey of Education (1928-30), of the Federal Office of Education. He reports that 800 American medical students attempted to enter one medical school in Scotland during 1930, and that there were five thousand more medical school applicants in 1929-30 than in 1926-27. The typical medical school graduate is 25 years old. He completes a four-year course, and generally supplements his medical school training with a one-year internship in an approved hospital before going into practice. The number of medical schools in the United States has decreased, but the 66 approved four-year schools graduate as many physicians as were prepared twenty years ago in twice this number of schools. No other country is so well supplied with medical services as the United States, which has one doctor to every 800 persons: corresponding numbers in other countries are—Switzerland, 1250; Denmark, 1430; England and Wales, 1490; Germany, 1560; France, 1690; the Netherlands, 1820; and Sweden, 2860.

Aptitude Tests for Selection of Medical Students

A total of 7468 aptitude tests were given between 1928 and 1930 to medical and pre-medical students by officials of 67 medical schools in the United States, two in Canada and one in the Philippines. Dr. F. A. Moss, Secretary of the Committee on Scholarship Aptitude Tests, has prepared statistical analyses showing the selective values of these tests. (*Jour. Assoc. of Am. Med. Col.*, Jan., 1931.) Scholastic records for the first two years of the medical course are closely related to the scores of the aptitude tests. Students were arranged in the order of these scores and divided into ten groups. The percentages of failures in the medical course during the freshman year were as follows: first decile, none; second, 1 per cent; third and fourth, 6 per cent; fifth, 11 per cent; sixth, 13 per cent; seventh, 16 per cent; eighth and ninth, 22 per cent; tenth, 42 per cent. During the sophomore year, there were no additional failures among those ranking with the upper forty per cent in the aptitude test, one per cent in fifth and eighth deciles, four in the seventh, 17 in the

¹ Abstracts prepared by Lucile Eaves from recent publications of the Association.

ninth, and 14 in the tenth. Thus over half (56 per cent) of the students who had ranked with the lowest tenth in the tests failed in their scholastic work by the end of the sophomore year.

The prediction values were shown clearly also when the students were divided into four groups. Those in the lowest quarter had 43 chances out of a hundred for failure by the end of the sophomore year. The aptitude tests predicted also the probable grades attained in the medical school. Dr. Moss summarizes his conclusions about the predictive values of aptitude tests and other means of rating as follows:

From our study, it appears that Aptitude Tests furnish a very useful criterion for predicting success in the medical school. It seems further that best results can be obtained by a combination of test results with other criteria for selecting students, especially with premedical grades. No one criterion gives a perfect prediction and only prolonged experimentation will show what is the most reliable combination of criteria. The predictive value of personal interview ratings does not seem to be very high, but this factor should be studied further in a larger number of schools and under better controlled conditions.

Replying to a recent inquiry about the use of tests for the selection of prospective medical students, Dr. Moss says:

The cooperation which we received this year from the pre-medical schools and the medical schools in carrying out the test program was excellent. The tests were given in somewhat over six hundred pre-medical schools to over nine thousand applicants for admission to the medical schools. The results of these tests have been sent to the admissions officers of all the medical schools in the United States. These will be used as one of the criteria in selecting students for next year's freshman medical classes. It is our understanding that most of the medical schools will use a three-fold criterion for considering students for admission. They will consider (1) test results, (2) pre-medical scholarship, (3) interview ratings and personal recommendations. It has not been the recommendation of our Committee that the test results replace any criteria which have been found of value in the past, but that they be used only as an additional criterion of value in predicting success in the study of medicine.

Cultural Values of Medical Training

Having discovered means for meeting the practical difficulties of selecting suitable candidates from the swarms of applicants for admission to medical schools, the doctors found time, at the most

recent meeting of the Association of American Medical Colleges, for discussion of the elusive cultural values of pre-medical and medical courses. Dean Edward S. Thorpe of the University of Pennsylvania Medical School, told of his experiences in interviewing hundreds of applicants who were well equipped with "units" in chemistry, biology, and physics, but who had but slight acquaintance with the masterpieces of literature. He declared:

When asked to write reports they cannot compose paragraphs with any facility; they cannot express themselves logically. They know nothing of history, philosophy, economics, or sociology. And yet, at the end of the first year in medicine, many of them receive the collegiate arts degree "in absentia." This term probably refers to the absence of knowledge as well as of the student at the exercises of graduation.

Dean Thorpe insisted that exceptionally thorough preparation in the pre-medical sciences did not insure success in the medical course. He urged that adequate attention be given to cultural subjects and that when presenting pre-medical sciences emphasis should be placed on fundamental principles and relations to other branches of knowledge. He reminded his colleagues that 98 per cent of the doctors will go forth to practice the art as well as the science of medicine.

Dean E. P. Lyon, of the University of Minnesota Medical School, opened what proved to be a lengthy, and often witty, discussion of the cultural values of the medical curriculum. He insisted that culture was characterized by catholicity of viewpoint and breadth of sympathies, and that the capacity for it was often inborn, congenital, hereditary; students capable of culture might acquire it from contact with some of their professors or might profit by all that was fine and uplifting in their surroundings. He insisted that the student will find culture "if he has the inner urge." The introductory papers were followed by a lengthy and eloquent discussion which emphasized such truths as:

It is not so much the subject that forms the curriculum as it is the way in which that subject is used to give mental training.

I think culture may come quite as much from the medical training as from the pre-medical. I think that culture, so far as it can be imparted to students, rests largely with the student.

It has been accepted by a number here that we cannot, to paraphrase, "Make a silk purse out of a sow's ear." If we have the silk, the purse can be made, and the culture can be instilled and the

finished product exhibit that culture quite as much after he gets into the medical school as before.

The curriculum is a race course and the horse that is on it is the result of breeding in that true sense, the biological sense. I do not mean that you have to begin with the grandparents in selecting students for medical schools, but I do mean that about nine-tenths of those selected will not be of the type that will get far in a cultural direction.

There is a good deal of talk in our universities about producing leaders. Some way it leaves me cold. I think leaders emerge. They are not ordinary men; they are not made leaders by formal education, although they may be assisted by it; they emerge. Look at Abe Lincoln; Al Smith.

SOCIAL SCIENCE RESEARCH COUNCIL, RESEARCH FELLOWSHIPS

The seventh annual awards of Research Fellowships were announced in February, 1931. Twenty-four new Fellows were appointed for 1931-32, and two extensions of 1930-31 fellowships were made. The total amount involved in these awards approximated \$75,000. Since the inception of the fellowship program in 1925, a total of 139 persons have been awarded Research Fellowships, with stipends aggregating over \$435,000.

As in previous years, the major objective of these fellowships continues to be the development of more adequately trained research investigators rather than the immediate execution of specific pieces of research. The holders of fellowships ordinarily have a year (in exceptional instances a somewhat longer period) entirely free from teaching and other duties, in which to secure further field training or clinical experience, to become acquainted with new points of view, schools of thought, or experimental work, and in many instances to apply the techniques and procedures of related disciplines to their own special fields of activity. As initially approved by the Fellowship Committee, the Fellows are allowed to carry out their programs of study wherever it seems most desirable—in this country or abroad.

The basic stipend attached to these fellowships for a period of twelve months is \$1800 for a single, and \$2500 for a married Fellow, with adjustments upward in case there are dependents. Supplementary allowances are granted to cover travel and incidental expenses as needed.

The Research Fellowships are open to both men and women of American or Canadian nationality provided (1) they are not over thirty-five years of age, and (2) they are the holders of the Ph.D.

degree or its equivalent in terms of other types of training and experience. In rare instances, the formal requirements stated above may be waived.

The closing date for making application for 1932-33 is December 1, 1931, the awards to be announced not later than March 1, 1932. Further information and application blanks may be had by addressing the Fellowship Secretary, Social Science Research Council, 230 Park Avenue, New York City.

The Council has also made extensive provision for Fellowships in Agricultural Economics and Rural Sociology, for Fellowships to be awarded to Southern graduate students, and for grants in aid of research.

RHODES SCHOLARSHIPS

Thirty-two Scholarships are assigned annually to the United States of America. For the election in 1931 the states of the Union are grouped into eight districts of six states each for the purpose of making these thirty-two appointments. There is a competition in every state. In each state there is a Committee of Selection which will nominate from the candidates applying to it the two best men to appear before the District Committee. Each District Committee will then select from the 12 candidates so nominated not more than four men who will represent their states as Rhodes Scholars at Oxford. State Committees will meet on Saturday, December 5, and District Committees a few days later. Each candidate must make application to the secretary of the committee of selection of the state in which he wishes to compete not later than October 17.

In order to place all candidates upon an equality whatever their place of residence may be, railway fares (but not hotel expenses) of candidates nominated by State Committees to appear before their District Committee will be paid by the Trustees from the candidate's place of residence in the State for which he is applying to the place of meeting of the District Committee. Candidates must, however, pay their own expenses in appearing before State Committees.

In any state where the number of applicants is large a preliminary elimination will be made on the basis of credentials. Committees of Selection will then summon to a personal interview such of the candidates as they find it desirable to see, and, save under exceptional circumstances, no Scholar will be elected without such interview. Candidates who find it impossible to appear before the Committee

on December 5 may have their interviews especially arranged for either in absence or in advance, provided, they make early application to the Secretary of the Committee before which they are competing. Secretaries should, if possible, have requests for such special arrangements in hand by October 17. Candidates who anticipate inability to appear before the State Committee on December 5 are advised to interview the individual members of the State Committee in advance if and when they find that possible. This can be arranged through the Secretary of the State Committee.

Information can be obtained from the Secretary of the Committee of Selection in his state or from Dr. Frank Aydelotte, American Secretary to the Rhodes Trustees, Swarthmore, Pa.

JOURNAL OF HIGHER EDUCATION

The Journal, of which appreciative mention has previously been made in the *Bulletin*, offers our membership the opportunity of subscription at a special rate. A prospectus circular covering details will be mailed in the near future.

ENGINEERING EDUCATION

The *Journal of Engineering Education* for April, 1931, contains an extended address on "Professional Ethics and Practices in Engineering," with an outline of the history of professional codes of ethics and a special section on the ethics of engineering faculties.

The *Journal* also contains the following letter from the American Society of Civil Engineers:

Adequate professional training in actual engineering practice is essential, in addition to university training, as part of the qualifications of engineering teachers, and is entitled to due recognition. While approving the continuing development now under way of graduate work in engineering leading to advanced degrees, including the Ph.D. degree, attempts by any college or university association to demand Ph.D. degrees in general branches as part of the requirements for the engineering professors in accredited colleges is disapproved.

AMERICAN MAP COMPANY

Acknowledgment is made of the courtesy of the American Map Company in connection with the use of one of its outline maps of the United States, published in the January *Bulletin*, page 127. Proper acknowledgment at the time was inadvertently omitted.

ACADEMIC FREEDOM AND TENURE AT THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY

REPORT ON THE DISMISSAL OF PROFESSOR HERBERT A. MILLER

[In June, 1931, a sub-committee of Committee A investigated the dismissal of Professor Herbert A. Miller from the Ohio State University. The sub-committee's chairman was Professor A. B. Coble (University of Illinois); the other members were Professors A. O. Craven (University of Chicago), J. W. Martin (University of Kentucky), and A. J. Todd (Northwestern University). At the University the investigating committee had a courteous reception. It seems unfortunate, however, that the Board of Trustees declined to discuss the situation and that an interview with President Rightmire was, as Professor Coble writes, "not very illuminating on some aspects." The body of the sub-committee's report is printed below. Space limitations compel omission of some appendices, and a few slight changes in phrasing have thus become necessary. Such changes are indicated by square brackets. The statement referred to by the report as Appendix C is introduced at the beginning because it embodies the trustees' version of the case and is subjected to much comment herein.]

APPENDIX C

For release to morning papers of Wednesday, May 27, 1931

Joint Statement by Board of Trustees and President George W. Rightmire, of Ohio State University

The Board of Trustees of the Ohio State University is fully conscious of its responsibility to the people of Ohio. It was with this obligation in mind that the Board reached the decision twelve months ago not to re-engage Professor Herbert A. Miller, of the Department of Sociology, after the present year.

The decision in the case of Doctor Miller was arrived at after careful consideration. It is a decision which was made on its individual merits.

In this connection, the Board wishes to emphasize the fact that members of the faculty of the Ohio State University have enjoyed, and now enjoy, wide latitude in expressing their opinions in the class-

room. It also wishes to quote from its By-Laws which make it plain that while, under the laws of Ohio, it is required "to elect the President, members of the Faculty and all employees annually, it is the desire and intention of the Board that they shall be permanent in their positions, subject to continued efficiency in service."

Since Doctor Miller has made certain statements in the press, the Board feels impelled to make known the reasons for its action. Following this presentation, the Board declines to engage in further discussion.

Professor Miller came to Ohio State University in 1924. From his very first year here, complaints were received from parents of students in his classes and from others about his teaching on the relations of the races and on domestic relations. As long ago as 1927 serious questions arose in the Board of Trustees about re-engaging him because of these increasing complaints.

Professor Miller was on leave of absence from the University for the year 1929-30, traveling in Asia and elsewhere and during that period it was reported that he had been escorted by the Japanese police from a public meeting in Korea where he was making an address on matters forbidden by the Japanese authorities.

On March 13, 1930, the press reported a speech that Professor Miller had made in Bombay on March 12 at a gathering of Hindus on the eve of Gandhi's "salt march." This address was reported to have been made at a large meeting of people opposed to British rule in India, and had therefore an international aspect.

When the Board of Trustees on May 13, 1930, came to consider the operating budget for the next year, the question of continuing Professor Miller again came up. His record over the preceding four years was considered along with the reports from Korea and from India. After long discussion it was agreed that he would be continued for 1930-31, but that his name would not be placed on the budget for 1931-32 and that he would be so informed upon his return.

In reaching this decision, the Board proceeded entirely in accordance with its rule concerning tenure, already referred to. This has been in effect for a number of years, and it also says: "but the legal right is reserved to terminate such service at such time as the Board may deem best for the interest of the University, and all employment must be accepted upon this condition."

Upon Professor Miller's return to the University last fall, the action of the Board was communicated to him with a detailed statement of

the reasons therefor. He then said he would furnish a copy of the exact language which he had used in his address at Bombay on March 12, 1930, which he did as follows:

I do not think it appropriate for an American to speak at this time. I am simply the sort of a professor who is interested in learning how people try to solve their problems. India has been experimenting with religion for five thousand years, and now all the world is watching to see how she applies religion to the solution of her internal and external problem.

In his letter, he added, "That is all I said."

The evidence is, however, that he said a great deal more. This was reported in the *Bombay Chronicle*, from which the Associated Press got its account through Reuter's. This report has since been verified from Bombay. The *Bombay Chronicle* of March 13, 1930, carried the following account:

Professor Herbert Miller who was next called upon to speak said: "I feel that it is not right that an American should be asked to speak at this meeting. But I am a professor who is interested in the way human beings are trying to solve their problems. I have spent five years in India and have seen many of the great men of India. I know that the whole world is looking toward that noble experiment which Mahatma Gandhi has started, and they are trying to discover two things. The first is, how much are you interested in the movement and second how will you settle the differences between you.

"I feel that this movement is very characteristic of the history of India. For the last five thousand years the great contribution of India has been religion. The thing you are trying to do now is to bring religion to the solution of the two great problems that I have mentioned, namely, the problem of settling your differences in a genuine religious spirit and the problem of applying religion to the solution of practical problems. The success of this movement will be the greatest contribution that India would ever make to human affairs," he concluded.

The account stated that Professor Miller's remarks were received "amidst cheers." According to this report, here was an American professor, an employee of the university of a state whose nation was at peace with Great Britain, helping to incite the Hindus to civil disobedience.

Since the Board of Trustees will soon give consideration to the budget for 1931-32, Professor Miller has been reminded that his services will no longer be required after his present contract expires. During the past year, the case of Professor Miller has been considered

a number of times, but the Board has not seen, and does not now see, any reason to change its decision of last May.

The Situation in the University Prior to the Action of the Board of Trustees on May 13, 1930

The location of Ohio State University at Columbus, the capital of the state, is a material handicap to the development of its educational program under independent and far-sighted leadership. The city does not exhibit true metropolitan toleration, or perhaps indifference, toward the University, and within it there seems to occur rather rapid growth and strong expression of group opinion. With trustees appointed by the governor, with three trustees out of seven resident in the city, constantly under the eye of the Legislature to which it must apply for its support, the University experiences difficulty in maintaining that detachment from political influences and popular prejudices in which its scholarly work and educational activities can be most effectively pursued.

The present Board of Trustees has been in office since 1924-25, and its chairman, Mr. Julius F. Stone, had also served as a Trustee from 1909 to 1917. Among those who differentiate at all between members of the Board, opinion is practically unanimous that Chairman Stone is the dominant figure on the Board. This precedence, natural enough in the case of a member of such long service, is fortified by a strong financial position and by influential political connections. He is described as a man of aggressive personality, notable for interest in, and support of, the natural and physical sciences; and equally notable for his prejudices in social matters. It is perhaps quite natural that the Board, under such leadership, should display that slight measure of judicial temperament which will appear in the case before us. We have had no opportunity to meet the Trustees personally nor have we had any help from them in forming correct judgments. In order therefore to confirm the above view of the esteem in which Chairman Stone is held by the Board we [quote part of a statement by Mr. Herbert S. Atkinson, one of its members]. He speaks of Mr. Stone as one "whose very heart and soul are wrapped up in the welfare and up-building of the University" and says that the members of the Board "love and respect Mr. Stone and know more than any others his fine attitude toward and his great generosity to the University."

It appears that there has been an increasing tendency on the part of the present Board toward the adoption of a proprietary interest in the

University. There were reported by responsible members of the Faculty instances in which the Board exercised its power, or members of the Board their influence, in matters which normally are entirely under the control of the Faculty, or of its administrative officers. Some of these relate to interference by members of the Board in cases of admissions, of reinstatement, and of grades of students in particular courses; to the granting of degrees in border line cases by the Board without approval of the Faculty, either without the knowledge of the dean concerned, or over his protest; and to giving increases of salary to members of the instructional staff without recommendation of the head of the department, the dean, or the president.

The impression made by such actions of the Board upon the faculty is expressed as follows in a letter from a highly respected faculty member:

"The main trouble with the Board, as I see it, is that they fail to recognize the division of function that in nearly all institutions of learning prevails between Board and Faculty; and this leads to an interest in personal and relatively unimportant details rather than to a university or institutional outlook. For example, the voice of the protesting citizen sometimes seems more convincing than the judgment of the dean, despite the fact that the protesting citizen is usually concerned with a son or daughter in trouble or unable to understand the professor, and that the dean has had wide experience and has accumulated much wisdom in dealing with such cases. To deal independently with them can result only in injustice and confusion Along with this tendency has gone a rather growing attitude of lack of respect and absence of courtesy toward the Faculty as such—not toward the individual members of the Faculty. For example, it is a rare thing for the Board to formally acknowledge to the Faculty the receipt of any motion or recommendation sent to it by the Faculty, though the action of the Board is frequently informally announced by the President, and is printed in the minutes of the Board in the Alumni Monthly." The writer then gives an example relating to the work of a faculty committee which had for some years studied the matter of retiring allowances and group insurance, and had prepared a printed report urging general lines of procedure by the Board. "This was passed by the unanimous vote of those present at a large meeting of the Faculty and was transmitted to the Board. The Faculty has never received any reply. The Board did, however, instruct the President to create a committee to bring to it a detailed specific plan. This was

presented last June, but no action was taken until April. The Board then called the committee men one at a time, and the impression they gained was that the Board regarded them as on the defensive in a questionable transaction rather than as men earnestly desiring to promote the best interests of the University. I think the Board regards the committee as still functioning but there is little inducement for further activity."

The same curt and dictatorial attitude of the Board toward the Faculty, and the same apparent reluctance to cooperate effectively with the Faculty in important matters of educational policy may be observed in the account (Appendix F) by Professor Sabine of the rejection by the Board of the Arts College curriculum.

The opinions expressed above are confirmed by many members of the Faculty. Later public statements of the Board also support these opinions. In speaking of its responsibilities to the people of the state the Board says that "the final determination of these responsibilities is imposed by statute upon the Board of Trustees." The lengths to which the Board may go in asserting its legal position may be inferred from the concluding paragraph of the Action of the Board of Trustees concerning Military Training which reads as follows:

"The Board feels that the University should not be subjected to emotional criticism because of the unripe vociferations of a small group of students and a very few members of the Faculty who were under no compulsion to come here and are under none to remain unless they can subscribe to the fundamental purposes of this University."

The peculiar constitution of the Board to Trustees becomes of greater importance in the light of the character and attitudes of the present head of the University. President G. W. Rightmire is a man of undoubted sincerity and good intentions. Yet he lacks both the ability and the desire to afford an aggressive representation of faculty rights and opinions. His Faculty respect him as a man but, in the main, doubt his power to look after their interests as opposed to those of a business-minded Board of Trustees. His understanding of his office is strictly legalistic. He seemingly has no conception of himself as the leader of a great educational institution. He frankly states that he feels that his duty is to present all faculty or educational matters to the Board, and then, as the agent of the Board, to carry out their decisions. As nearly as your committee could discern he made no fight whatsoever before the Board to alter its intentions or

actions in this case. He seems merely to have been its agent in carrying out a procedure determined on by the Board members themselves. He definitely states that he had never received complaints regarding Professor Miller and that he did not find fault with the classroom teachings of Professor Miller.

Professor Miller is a scholar of high standing in sociology, an authority in the particular field of race relations. His contacts and investigations in foreign fields—in Czecho-Slovakia, China, and India—have been of considerable public interest. He has been active as well in connection with domestic race relations. His views and speeches on these matters have received a degree of publicity which has occasioned some criticism in faculty circles. With his "laboratory practice" in the study of race relations we deal more fully later. It is most significant that he is highly esteemed both by his students and by his colleagues in sociology, and that they give him practically unanimous support in this case. Professor J. E. Hagerty says: "I have been head of the department twenty-eight years, during ten years of the time the Dean of the College. I have found no one with whom I have dealt here in the College or Department more satisfactory to work with, more cooperative, more sane and reasonable in his points of view than Dr. Miller has been."

The Action of the Board of May 13, 1930

In 1924, Professor Miller, then at Oberlin College, was appointed to a chair in Sociology at Ohio State University. Prior to this appointment President Thompson had made the customary examination of his record and of his standing, had learned of his views and of his teaching, and had reported on these matters to the Board of Trustees. These views appeared equally unobjectionable to President Rightmire last year. Professor Miller also had lectured at Columbus just after the War to an audience which contained many members of the faculty. Thus Professor Miller's appointment was made with a full understanding of his personality and of his views on race questions. He served as professor at Ohio State from this time with leaves of absence during the fall and winter quarters of 1925-26 and the fall, winter, and spring quarters of 1929-30. In the last three years he taught only advanced undergraduate and graduate students. During all this time no formal complaints of any kind had been received by the President, the Dean of his college, the head of his department, or by Dr. Miller himself.

At the meeting of the Board of Trustees on May 13, 1930, "Mr. Mack presented the following motion which was seconded by Mr. Atkinson: That the name of Professor H. A. Miller, Department of Sociology, be dropped from the 1930-31 budget but that his salary be paid until September 1, 1930. Upon roll call the vote resulted as follows: Ayes, Messrs. Mack and Atkinson; Nays, Mrs. Paterson, Messrs. Stone, Laybourne, Kaiser, and Caton. The Chairman declared the motion lost." The minutes of the Board contain nothing more on this matter than has just been quoted. At this time, however, the Board entered into an "agreement" or "reached a decision" (cf. Appendix C) that his name would not be placed on the budget for 1931-32, and that he would be so informed upon his return. President Rightmire says that he had, at no time since this action was taken, the authority of the Board to express any assurance that this agreement would not be enforced. It is therefore the action taken at this time which resulted finally in the dismissal of Professor Miller.

The Board gives (Appendix C) three reasons for this action of May 13, 1930, which may be briefly described as (a) the incident in Korea; (b) the Bombay speech; and (c) recurring complaints from parents and others.

There is no evidence that the Board had in May, 1930, any information concerning the Korean incident though there is a possibility that it had some confidential knowledge of the matter. It was not mentioned in the conversations of President Rightmire with Professor Miller, or with Professor Hagerty, during the following October (cf. Appendices G, H). The incident came to departmental notice through a semi-humorous account of it by Professor Miller himself after his return. The Trustees say of this incident that "it was reported that he had been escorted by the Japanese police from a public meeting in Korea where he was making an address on matters forbidden by the Japanese authorities." In contrast with this version of the Trustees, Professor Miller's statement with respect to the incident is that the Japanese police ordered him to stop speaking when he used the word "republic" in connection with Czecho-Slovakia, this being a forbidden word in Korea. Yet your committee would emphasize that the Board definitely includes this incident among the grounds for its action of May 13, 1930, though no mention of this cause for action against Dr. Miller was made by the President or the Board before May 27, 1931; *i. e.*, six days after Dr. Miller was actually dismissed.

Of the Bombay speech three versions are pertinent to our inquiry. Two appear in Appendix C. The first of these two is that of Professor Miller himself, and in Appendix G there is found his account of the circumstances which led to the delivery of the speech and to the preservation of the version. The second of the two is the version which appeared in the *Bombay Chronicle* of March 13, 1930. For the moment neither need concern us, since neither was in possession of the Board in May, 1930. The third version (in chronological order the first) is contained in a Reuter's dispatch from Bombay which appeared in the *Ohio State Journal*, March 13, 1930. This is reproduced in Appendix I. In the fall of 1930, President Rightmire characterized this version to Professor Hagerty as "all there was to the Miller case" (quotation from Professor Hagerty; cf. Appendix H). This third version was therefore one of the bases for the action of May, 1930.

In examining Appendix I we may disregard the headlines and the supplementary dispatch dated from New Delhi [this dispatch has been omitted herefrom] and consider only the last two paragraphs of the London dispatch which give the gist of Professor Miller's speech. These two paragraphs read as follows:

"In the course of his remarks Dr. Miller said the whole world was keenly watching Mahatma Gandhi's novel experiment and that he felt the movement was characteristic of India's history.

"The great contribution of India during the past thousand years had been religion, he said, and what the movement was intended to do now was to apply religion to the solution of two great problems, namely, the settling of Indian internal differences and the practical political question. The success of the movement would be the greatest contribution India has ever made to human affairs, he said."

Your committee would express the opinion that these remarks were highly diplomatic. As the professor from Ohio State University he could not be inane, and if, at that particular time, he had chosen another topic, that topic might as well have been the weather. The speech recalled to an excited and potentially dangerous crowd the religious basis of their movement. It is true that Professor Miller might have avoided the limelight altogether, but this is not characteristic of him any more than it is characteristic of the numerous university professors and foreign lecturers who visit the United States.

* The *Ohio State Journal* in which this article appeared is published by the Ohio State Journal Co. whose President, E. T. Wolfe, and two of whose directors, R. H. Wolfe and H. P. Wolfe, are also directors of

the BancOhio Corporation of which Mr. Stone is president. Throughout recent controversies the *Journal*, and the similarly controlled *Columbus Dispatch*, have strongly supported the actions of the Trustees of the University, and have bitterly denounced the actions of the faculty, both in editorials and in cartoons. Whether the Trustees in turn accepted without scrutiny this highly colored account of Professor Miller's speech, a notable example of journalistic enterprise, or whether the account merely crystallized the feeling that they had in Professor Miller "a dangerous man," we cannot say. At all events the Bombay speech seemed to us so inoffensive as to induce us to examine with greatest care the third reason for the action of the Board; namely, the complaints "received from parents of students in his classes and from others about his teachings on the relations of the races and on domestic relations."

It is stated by the Board that these complaints had been received from about 1925, and that as early as 1927 they had been considered sufficiently serious to justify the contemplation of Professor Miller's dismissal. We fully expected to get from President Rightmire, as spokesman of the Board, some specific information with respect to these complaints. However, he informed us that he had not received such complaints, and that he had neither seen nor known of written complaints received by the Board. His surmise was that they had been received orally by members of the Board. He could not say whether individual complaints had been investigated. He could not say whether the complaints were in excess of the number to be expected in a controversial field though he had been told by the Trustees that they were numerous. He did say that the complaints had to do with opinions expressed by Professor Miller on matters within Miller's field (Race Relations), and that they came from organized groups as well as from parents. He said that he had *not* personally brought these complaints to the attention either of Professor Miller or of his department head, Professor Hagerty, or of his Dean, Professor Weidler of the College of Commerce.

At Ohio State University, as in most well organized universities, the normal procedure for dealing with complaints coming to the office of the President is to refer them to the Dean of the College, or the head of the department concerned, or both, for investigation and report. Practically all the administrators (department heads and deans) whom we interviewed at the University agreed that they would resent the dismissal of a subordinate on the basis of complaints with respect to

which they had not been consulted. That this normal and sensible procedure was not followed by the Trustees in the case of the complaints concerning Professor Miller is further evidence that the Board does not possess a proper feeling of responsibility toward its own Faculty, and of confidence in its own administration.

Professor Miller's subject is one which touches the profound convictions held by all men with respect to nationalism and race. In his university courses his views were liberal but not extreme. He taught that there are no great intrinsic differences between the races but that at present there are definite social objections to race mixtures. This is certainly a more moderate position than is taken by other scholars in this field. He did not advocate intermarriage (as sometimes reported) but emphasized rather the necessity for amicable relations.

Two other aspects of Professor Miller's work may have stirred up complaint or prejudice. One is a type of "laboratory practice" in race relations. He gave teas to which both white and colored people were invited. He took his students on inspection trips to Wilberforce University, a state-supported institution for negroes at Xenia, Ohio. [One such trip is described below in Dr. Miller's own words.¹] It should be pointed out that this was a purely voluntary visit, not required of students registered in the course, and that as a matter of fact hardly more than half of a large class took the trip. Without taking this case as typical it might perhaps be fairly said that some parents would condemn Professor Miller's attitude because it led to social practices objectionable to them. Most persons interviewed believed that this was the important source of complaints. On the other hand sociology is not a required subject. There may perhaps be no subjects which are required of all students at Ohio State, except military drill for male students. Even in the department of sociology, Professor Miller's courses constituted but a small part of the work

¹ "I had been asked by some of the students if they could make this trip. I asked the class if they wished to go, saying that I, myself, did not want to make the trip, not because I had any objection to the trip as such, but because I did not wish to take the time. The class was very earnest in its desire to go. Finally with some difficulty in selecting a time forty-two members of the class of seventy-five went to Wilberforce for a day. This happened to be the day of the public meeting at which I spoke on compulsory drill.

"I told the students that they would be entertained at lunch and would eat with some of the students and Faculty, not, however, at the regular lunch hour, and that we would try to arrange for them to visit houses of various members of the Faculty in order to see how educated colored people live. No one was required to go and I took no record of those who went. After the lunch, there was a period in which groups of four or five of my students were taken about the campus with two guides from the sociology class at Wilberforce. I did not accompany them. After they had been gone a while, however, I went to one of the fraternity houses where there was a considerable group of students. Someone was playing the piano and several of the white girls were dancing with colored men. I was surprised but said nothing."

Subsequently Dr. Miller was telephoned by a woman who asserted that her daughter was in his class, but refused to give her name. This woman was greatly shocked because white students "had been compelled to go to Wilberforce, compelled to eat with negroes and compelled to dance with them." Her ignorance of Dr. Miller's course led him to suspect that she had no daughter in it.

offered. Solicitous parents could with very little trouble be certain that their children would not come into contact with him.

A second aspect of Professor Miller's work was his connection with the Urban League (an organization formed in many cities to promote social welfare work among negroes) as chairman of its board in Columbus. We are informed by a student who had done four years of graduate work in Professor Miller's department, taken all his courses, and knew of his social work, that the colored people regarded Miller as a champion, and were doubtless inspired in seeking better conditions for living, and wider cultural opportunities, by the fact that such a man would work with them. This search for better living conditions, and presumably also for better working conditions, aroused some hostility among employers who felt that their bargaining power with labor had been hampered. Instances of this sort were reported to us.

In attempting to estimate the gravity and general validity of the complaints which the Board of Trustees received, it is not without significance that the Board permitted Professor Miller to continue to teach throughout the academic year 1930-31, and even exacted the extra quarter of teaching due (by reason of leaves of absence) to the University after Professor Miller's actual dismissal.

As to how far the Board itself was affected by race prejudice there is but little definite evidence. It did refuse on three separate occasions, contrary to conventional action in such cases, to grant fellowship status to negro students who were regularly recommended by the Graduate School but whose stipend was provided by the Urban League. With respect to the visit at Wilberforce a trustee was quoted as saying, "He made his students dance with niggers."

In closing this survey of the matter of complaints it should be emphasized again that Professor Miller's field was one in which complaints were to be expected and that such complaints were likely to be either ill-founded in prejudice, or magnified by reason of rumor and gossip. It is a field in which individual complaints should have received most careful scrutiny. The practice of the Board, in the exercise of the quasi-judicial power legally conferred upon it, in accepting such complaints without due examination and fair consideration, and in failing even to apprise Dr. Miller of their existence over a period of years, is a direct violation of its obligations to its Faculty who look to it for protection in the exercise of their proper functions, and of its obligations to the people of the state who look to it for an ad-

ministration of their university in accordance with the highest standards of truth, right, and justice.

The Status of Professor Miller in the Period between May 13, 1930, and the Notification of Dismissal Dated May 21, 1931

President Rightmire said to your committee that the question as to whether the action of May 13, 1930, constituted a legal dismissal had not been legally determined. As a mere agreement, and not an action by vote, formally recorded on the minutes, it could be terminated at any time by mutual consent. The Board discussed such termination "a number of times" (Appendix C) prior to May, 1931. Unfortunately the matter was in such shape that even a minority, by insistence on this "gentlemen's agreement," could block the termination of it. No formal vote on this decision has ever been mentioned by the Trustees or President in official statements, though Trustees Mack and Caton in newspaper interviews in May, 1931 (Appendix K) give reasons for their "vote" on the dismissal.

The course of events during the year in question is detailed at some length by Professor Hagerty (Appendix H) and by Professor Miller (Appendix G). We mention only some of the salient points.

The devious ways in which the news of the Board's action reached Professors Hagerty and Miller, and the refusal of the President to discuss the matter with Professor Hagerty, head of the department of Sociology, and his reluctance to discuss it with Dean Weidler of the College of Commerce (in which this department is found) before the return of Dr. Miller create an impression of the personal issue between the Board and Dr. Miller.

On the return of Dr. Miller to the University in the fall of 1930 he was notified by President Rightmire of the action of the Trustees. This notification led to strong protests from Professor Hagerty, Dean Weidler, and some other members of the Faculty who knew of the facts. After conferences in October, Professor Miller, Professor Hagerty, and Dean Weidler each left the President with a distinct impression that this dismissal was not necessarily final and that the President himself would investigate the charges. Each had the impression that if the charges proved to be unfounded the President would induce the Board to reconsider its decision. Thus when the President reported to them that there was "nothing to the Miller case" all three were justified in assuming that the case was closed. President Rightmire, when asked by us whether he *had*

given the impression mentioned above, replied: "I had no legal right to convey such an impression."

That Dean Weidler, Professor Hagerty, and Professor Miller all were led by President Rightmire to feel that the case against Professor Miller had been dropped during the fall and winter of 1930-31 fully explains the fact that Dr. Miller had not asked for an investigation during the year, a fact mentioned against Dr. Miller in an interview with a faculty member. This attitude of Dr. Miller was fully justified by the assurances received from his department head and dean of their understanding that the action against him would not be carried out. President Rightmire, when asked to give his reasons for leaving this impression, and for conducting his own investigation after the Board had made its decision, replied, "You must draw your own inferences." We felt, in view of the many expressions of personal esteem for the President from members of his faculty, and in view of his remarks to persons interested in this case, that the inference to be drawn was that the President was conscious of the weakness of the case and that he hoped to induce the Trustees to rescind their action. This, however, is only an inference.

There appear to have been three separate investigations into the Bombay speech. The first was conducted by the university publicity bureau before May, 1930, and yielded nothing beyond the Reuter account already quoted from the *Ohio State Journal*. The second was conducted by the President in the fall after he had received strong protests from the small group of the faculty which had learned of the action of the Trustees. This is described in full by Professor Hagerty (Appendix H). It also yielded nothing new. The third was conducted by Trustee Mack (at the instance of Chairman Stone, we were told) in January-March, 1931, and this brought to light the *Bombay Chronicle* version of the Bombay speech, and perhaps also the Korean incident already mentioned. One cannot help but feel that there existed a strong determination on the part of the Board, or within it, to find something to justify its action of May, 1930, even to the extent of re-examining Dr. Miller's record at Oberlin seven years before.

In the joint statement of the President and Trustees (Appendix C), and this was confirmed to us by the President, emphasis is laid on the difference between the two versions of the Bombay speech. Trustee Mack states in May, 1931, that this difference was his "chief reason" for "voting against the rehiring of Dr. Miller" (cf. Appendix K). In

the face of this statement it should be noted however that the Board had but one version in its hands in May, 1930, when the decision to dismiss was made. Trustee Caton's statement is: "I prefer not to say how I voted. The charges were in connection with his speech at Bombay. There was some other stuff, too." We repeat again that there is no record of a vote on this matter at any time. President Rightmire stated to us that the *Chronicle* report is undoubtedly correct² being confirmed by twelve reporters. It contains one positive error, viz., the statement, "I have spent five years in India." This period of time may have been a slip on the part of Dr. Miller or an average obtained from the twelve reporters. But we cannot agree with the Board that there is a difference in spirit in the two versions, that any weight is to be attached to different versions of an extemporaneous speech delivered at a time of great excitement, or that there is any impropriety in either version.

In the interval preceding Mr. Mack's investigation there seemed to be some real ground for believing that the agreement to drop Dr. Miller would not be pressed. A trustee is quoted as saying that the Miller case was dead. However, Mr. Mack's investigation must have convinced him at least to the contrary. The President says that no new complaints were being reported.

Thus the matter drifted along until an awkward combination of two circumstances disturbed the situation in May just before final action on the case of Dr. Miller was due. This was the debate on compulsory military drill and the consideration by the Legislature of the University appropriation. Faced with the certainty of a considerable cut in their appropriations on the score of economy, it is believed by some that the Trustees were inclined toward such action as might secure to the University the greatest support in the Legislature. Whether the sharp statement of the Board on compulsory military training of May 20, 1931, and the letter of dismissal to Professor Miller on May 21, were bids for legislative support, whether at a somewhat anxious moment the natural temper of the Board with respect to each case came to the surface somewhat more vividly than usual, whether Professor Miller's stand in the debate on military drill had any effect on the attitude of the Trustees toward him, are matters of opinion on which your committee cannot speak. It did satisfy itself that there was nothing in Professor Miller's conduct in the discussion on military

² There appeared recently in the *Times of India* (May 29, 1931), a Bombay newspaper with English sympathies, an account of Dr. Miller's dismissal and another version of the Bombay speech quite like that of Dr. Miller himself. This version may have been extracted from its files of March 12, 1930, though no indication of its origin is given.

drill which could legitimately have produced unfavorable action against him.

Dr. Miller's speech to the students at a meeting attended by the President was in no sense provocative; his remarks at faculty meetings were well within the limits of debate. President Rightmire says that Dr. Miller's stand on compulsory military drill was not considered by the Trustees. Faculty opinion on this point, however, is divided. We emphasize again that positive action looking toward Dr. Miller's dismissal had been taken a year before and that thereafter a determined and continuous effort had been made by the Trustees to build up a plausible case against him.

The present case appears to be one in which unusual importance is attached to "incidents." We may therefore be pardoned for completing our survey of the case against Dr. Miller by relating an incident which will indicate the weight given by the Board and President to some of the factors involved. The father of Mrs. Fisher (Dorothy Canfield) was a former president of the University. This spring she was voted an honorary degree to be conferred at the recent commencement. After the dismissal of Dr. Miller she was advised to refuse to take the degree. She sent a telegram to President Rightmire stating that perhaps the Board did not know the things for which she stood and that, if they did, perhaps they would not wish to give her a degree—that she favored optional military drill, had great sympathy with the Gandhi movement, was anxious for negroes to have an improved social and economic position, and did not consider these to be in conflict "with the fundamental purposes of the University." She then asked to be advised of the Board's attitude toward giving her a degree in view of this position. The President wired her that her position would in no way be a bar to giving her a degree, and asked her to appear and receive the degree, which she did.

The Conclusions of the Committee with Respect to the Miller Case

Your committee agrees in reporting the following conclusions:

1. That the Bombay speech (in any of its versions) was a proper expression of opinion from an authority in Dr. Miller's field, and that it aroused no objection with respect to its propriety in any responsible quarter other than the Board of Trustees of Ohio State University.
2. That the difference in the two versions quoted by the Board is one of the text rather than thought, and that this difference is not greater than might be expected from their different origins.

We may recall here that the Board has included in the public statement of their reasons for the decision of May, 1930, to dismiss Dr. Miller, the incident in Korea of which no mention is made until after the dismissal of Dr. Miller in May, 1931.

3. That the visits of Dr. Miller to India and Korea in 1929-30 at a time of disturbed race relations were entirely normal for a scientist in his field, and that it is a common and accepted practice for foreign lecturers of distinction to address interested, or even partisan, audiences.

4. That the views expressed by Dr. Miller in his writings and teaching were more moderate than those held by other distinguished workers (sociologists and anthropologists) in his field.

5. That, if the complaints received by the Board over a period of five years were numerous and came from responsible sources (of which we have no evidence), the Board was derelict in its obligations toward Dr. Miller and its own administrators in not turning these complaints over to them for consideration or investigation.

6. That the participation of Dr. Miller in the faculty debate and student discussion of compulsory military drill was not of such character as to afford the Board additional provocation for its notification of dismissal of May 21, 1931.

7. That the action of the Board in dismissing Dr. Miller on the basis of the counts mentioned in 1-5 is concrete evidence of an attitude toward freedom of speech for its faculty which is directly opposed to sound public policy, to good educational practice, and to long established university ideals.

8. That the procedure followed by the Board in dismissing Dr. Miller has violated every essential safeguard which our Association has advocated in its endeavor to secure fair treatment and unbiased decision in cases where freedom of speech and security of tenure are involved. Before taking its action of May 13, 1930, the Board of Trustees had not adequately investigated the case against Dr. Miller; it had not given to Dr. Miller, or to his faculty superiors a statement of the charges against him, and of the evidence which supported them; it had allowed him no opportunity to present evidence in his own favor; and it had not secured the advice and judgment of disinterested persons competent in Dr. Miller's field.

Your committee feels that the above conclusions are amply supported by the evidence contained in the appendices. It feels that it should also record its opinion based to some extent on information

received in confidence. This opinion is that there had existed in the Board for some time an animus against Dr. Miller, that the Bombay speech was taken up as a pretext for immediate action against him, and that the later investigations by the Board were pursued for the purpose of obtaining additional grounds for this action. This animus may have had its origin in personal dislike, in social friction, in race prejudice, in the irritation produced by recurring personal disagreements with Dr. Miller's expressed views, and by complaints and criticisms (if any) from persons having the ear of the Board members, or in some combination of these factors.

The Present Status of Freedom of Speech and Security of Tenure at Ohio State University

Following the debate on compulsory military drill and the dismissal of Dr. Miller in the latter part of May there ensued at Ohio State a period of rather intense controversy on these and related matters of which we heard much during our visit of June 16-19. Some aspects, such as that relating to alleged "Red" activity, are not worth consideration. Other aspects, however, and in particular those which have to do with the current status of freedom of speech and security of tenure at Ohio State, are of interest and importance to our Association, to the academic profession, and to the general public.

All persons connected with Ohio State, including the professorial staff, hold their positions under contract for one year, a contract whose teeth are exposed by the Board in Appendix C. We repeat their quotation: "The legal right is reserved to terminate such service at such time as the Board may deem best for the interest of the University, and all employment must be accepted upon this condition." As a result any member of the staff may be dropped without any formal action by the Board, and without any notice, except as the failure to receive a renewal may be regarded as notice. Thus merely oral agreement by the Board, rather than a formal procedure, with the vote of individual trustees duly recorded in the minutes, may result, and has resulted, in the dismissal of important University officers. The nonchalant attitude of Trustee Caton, as expressed in Appendix K, toward the dismissal of Dr. Miller, an act which has aroused nation-wide resentment, is an instance of the tendency of the present regulations to awaken in the mind of the individual Trustee a feeling of irresponsibility toward faculty appointees.

It is true that there has been a presumption of permanence of

tenure, as well as of freedom of speech, at Ohio State. Deans have been accustomed to reassure prospective professors with a statement that the one-year contract exists merely to conform to legal requirements and that renewal is a matter of form. Doubtless such a statement was made to Dr. Miller. Some members of the faculty assured us that they felt no lack of security of tenure and no restriction of expression. A few expressed complete confidence in the Board in its entire course of action in the past year. It should be said that this more hopeful group was confined to those fields of university work which are essentially non-controversial. Nevertheless a decided majority of those interviewed affirmed that their confidence of earlier years with respect to these matters had been undermined or completely destroyed by the temper and actions of the present Board and President.

The Board states in a communication of June 2 that "a survey of the Board's attitude and practice over the years shows the most careful consideration of the freedom of the teacher; the Board has no thought of changing its purposes or its practices in that matter." Yet the present Board and President are not the Board and President of a decade ago, and many have expressed the conviction that the attitude and practice of the present Board and President are very different from that which has prevailed.

In two communications the Board speaks, in the one case, of "fundamental purposes of the University" and, in the other, of "clear responsibilities to the people of Ohio." It emphasizes that the determination of these purposes and responsibilities is conferred upon it by statute. It admits, as every one does, the difficulty of defining such purposes and responsibilities as well as the like difficulty of defining academic freedom. It does not admit, however, even by implication, the propriety of discussion and debate on such matters within the Faculty, and between the Faculty and the Board. The statement (Appendix C)—"that members of the Faculty of Ohio State University have enjoyed, and now enjoy, wide latitude in expressing their opinions *in the classroom*" (the italics are ours)—is the clearest statement on freedom of speech vouchsafed by the Board and no Faculty would consider this an adequate recognition of freedom of speech.

The public position of President Rightmire does not differ essentially from that of the Trustees. Several of their statements are joint statements. In his own statement on university spirit he

speaks, on the basis of "current report," of the attitude of a few professors toward "fundamental and abiding interests of a wise educational program." These are no doubt the same "few members of the faculty" whose tenure is so clearly threatened in the statement of the Board on Military Training. Until the President and Board of Trustees can definitely assure the faculty that all University procedures and policies, including decisions of the Board itself, are legitimate topics for orderly discussion and criticism by the Faculty it is idle to assert that freedom of speech prevails at Ohio State University.

The trouble, as we see it, lies both in the insistence by the Board on its position of legal authority, and in its failure to recognize that it holds a position of public trust. From this latter point of view, decisions with respect to fundamental purposes, clear responsibilities, and educational programs should be made only after it has received the advice of its own Faculty clarified by full and frank discussion within the Faculty. A university faculty is a body of long training and wide experience, which has an intimate knowledge of its own educational problems and a due recognition of its own and of the university's obligations to the public. Its collective advice should be accorded great weight in the determination of university purposes and policies.

A statement of their position on academic freedom, tenure, and the re-instatement of Dr. Miller, signed by a large number of faculty members, was presented to the Board on June 5. On June 15 the Board held an extended conference with seven faculty representatives. An opinion was expressed that a sympathetic contact essential to further progress had been made at this meeting. These are hopeful indications of the possibility of restoring in the future at Ohio State University that harmonious cooperation between Faculty and Trustees which had existed there and which now exists in more favored State Universities.

Recently (July 20, 1931) the Board of Trustees has adopted and announced a statement of a procedure to be followed in cases where the tenure of members of the teaching staff is involved. The procedure is quite satisfactory, and it should afford security of tenure to the faculty if it is administered justly. The preamble to this statement asserts that the procedure outlined has been "normally followed for many years in the Ohio State University" and that it "will be followed in the future." That this procedure was *not* fol-

lowed in the case against Dr. Miller confirms our opinion that there existed some animus against him within the Board.

It is no doubt very unlikely that the present Board will take that one action which will do most to restore its reputation for just dealing—namely, the re-instatement of Dr. Miller. But, unless the Board can satisfactorily clarify its position with respect to freedom of speech for the faculty both within and without the institution, Ohio State will not soon regain its former prestige as a university.

APPENDIX F

Rejection by the Board of the Arts College Curriculum

When he assumed the presidency in 1926, Dr. Rightmire put before the University what he called the "Freshman Problem," by which he meant the improvement of teaching in the first two years, or junior area as it was called. This was generally understood to be the policy with which the President identified himself. A Central Committee on the Freshman Problem was appointed to which was referred, among other questions, "the feasibility of introducing a junior college organization" for the University. After exhaustive study this committee reported to the Faculty in 1928; its report was adopted by the Faculty and the report as adopted was approved by the Board of Trustees on March 12, 1928 (Proceedings, July 1, 1927 to June 30, 1928, p. 68).

Two of the provisions of this report were as follows:

That at the present time the proposed junior division of the University at large should not be approved.

That the University Faculty recommend for the consideration of the Colleges of Agriculture, Arts, Commerce and Administration, Education, and Engineering the plan of organization on the basis of junior and senior divisions within these colleges. It likewise recommends that these colleges consider the advisability of adopting a selective principle of admission into their senior divisions.

Taking this action of University Faculty and Trustees to be in the nature of an instruction, the College of Arts and Sciences immediately appointed a committee and on May 23, 1928, the faculty of the College approved (1) an organization in junior and senior divisions; (2) a selective principle of admission to the senior division, *viz.*, a point-ratio of 1.9 for admission to the senior division, with a point-ratio of 2.2 for graduation. This legislation was ratified by the University

Faculty on December 13, 1928, and the requirement was printed in the College Bulletin for the two following years, to become effective when the freshman class first entering after its publication should have reached the point of admission to the senior division.

The College of Arts and Sciences further instructed its committee to report legislation to implement the organization of the College in a junior and a senior division. After careful study of the curricular problems involved this committee recommended extensive changes in the curriculum of the College and its report was approved unanimously by the College faculty on October 27, 1930. Later the new curriculum was approved by the Council on Instruction and by the Administrative Council; it had therefore the approval of every educational agency in the University which had any concern with the matter.

In all respects the new curriculum dealt exclusively with educational questions. Among the more important were requirements for the A.B. degree in both junior and senior divisions, the substitution of required proficiencies for required courses, the closer integration of courses of study, provision for courses to be offered cooperatively by two departments, improvement in planning majors for students in the senior division, together with changes in the organization of the faculty to make these educational purposes effective.

At its meeting on March 9, 1931, the Board of Trustees adopted the following resolution relative to the new curriculum of the College of Arts and Sciences:

That the curriculum report and recommendations be returned to that College without action thereon, and that the College withhold enforcement of the increased point-hour ratios announced in the College Bulletin, namely, 1.9 for advancement to the Senior Division and 2.2 for graduation; and that the University Faculty be hereby requested to give consideration to the creation and organization of a two-year junior division which will underlie all the colleges of the University and which will afford appropriate preparation for the advance of the student into any of the colleges, and make report with recommendations to the Board of Trustees at the earliest practicable time.

In respect to this curriculum, therefore, the Board has placed itself in the following positions:

1. In 1928 it approved a recommendation that the College consider an organization in junior and senior divisions and in 1931, by returning the curriculum without action, it prevented the College

from carrying through the changes which its faculty deemed necessary so to organize itself.

2. In 1928 the Board approved a recommendation that the College consider a selective principle of admission to its senior division and in 1931 it forbade the College to enforce legislation to this end which had been printed in the College Bulletin for two preceding years.

3. In 1928 the Board endorsed the statement that a junior division of the university at large should not be approved and in 1931 it requested the University Faculty to consider a junior division underlying all colleges of the University, though such a plan had been exhaustively considered prior to its first action.

4. It arrogated to itself the power to reject educational policies which had been adopted after long consideration by the college faculty directly concerned and which had the approval of every educational agency of the University empowered to pass upon them.

Neither the Board nor the President has ever offered any explanation of the preceding points. Moreover, nothing is known of the President's position relative to the rejected curriculum. He was universally supposed to be in favor of the report adopted in 1928, and the curriculum was intended by everyone in the College of Arts who was concerned with it as a loyal effort to give effect to what were imagined to be the President's policies. When the enforcement of the selective principle became imminent (after being printed as a prospective requirement for two years) he wrote a letter to the Dean of the College, in which he expressed anxiety about the attitude of parents toward it. At no time did he state unequivocally that he was for or against it. At the present time no one knows what position, if any, he took in presenting the Curriculum to the Board.

GEORGE H. SABINE

APPENDIX G

Ohio State University
May 26, 1931

Dr. H. W. Tyler,
American Association of University Professors,
744 Jackson Place,
Washington, D. C.

My dear Dr. Tyler:

When I was in Beirut a year ago, some of my friends wrote me that the Chairman of the Board of Trustees of the University was very

much aroused over the report of a speech I had made in Bombay on the evening of March 12, 1930. The speech was so innocuous that I dismissed the matter.

Shortly after my return in October, President Rightmire told me that at the meeting of the Trustees on May 13, a motion was made that I "be dropped instanter." There were two votes for this, the chairman not voting. The President then investigated various allegations which had been raised as to the basis of their action: (1) My activities in India; (2) that I had been on the point of being dismissed from Oberlin when I came to Ohio State University in 1924; and (3) that my attitude on matters of Race were (sic) unsound.

Further, during this conference, in October, he told me in reference to the above three points: (1) That as the result of his investigations, he found nothing that indicated anything reprehensible in my Indian activity, but rather the reverse. He found that the British Government had made no mention of me to our State Department. Later he asked me to write him a statement about my Bombay speech to which I replied as follows:

November 5, 1930

My dear President Rightmire:

The circumstances of my Bombay speech were as follows:

I had seen a notice that there was to be a meeting in the city park on the evening of the day the march of Mr. Gandhi had started. Since I was leaving India the next day I wanted to get as much of the atmosphere as possible. I took my camera, and with Mrs. Miller, was taking pictures. The crowd was sitting on the ground surrounded by a circle of people standing. I was outside the standing circle with no intention of getting nearer. After a time one of the young men, to whom I had been introduced by an Indian, who had been an instructor at the University of Wisconsin, came and begged us to come into the center near the speaker's stand. I demurred, but finally yielded thinking that it would give me a better opportunity to learn what was being said. After we had been seated a few minutes I was asked to speak and refused several times, but the urging was so persistent that finally Mrs. Miller said that she thought it was hardly courteous to refuse since they had been so kind to us. I said that I might not say what was agreeable and the reply was: "That makes no difference as we want criticism."

During the interval I tried to think of something worthy of the occasion but non-committal, realizing, of course, that the purpose of the meeting was very serious. Immediately on my return to my room I wrote that I had said as follows:

"I do not think it appropriate for an American to speak at this time. I am simply the sort of a professor who is interested in learning how people try to solve their problems. India has been experimenting with religion for five thousand years, and now all the world is watching to see how she applies religion to the solution of her internal and external problems."

That is all I said. I presumed that the local papers might mention it but I confess that I was greatly surprised that anything so obvious and so true, but so trite, could be interpreted as news. From that time on, in the Near East, in Europe, and America I have found that it is just this interest in the religious aspects of the Indian situation that attracts attention, and in my opinion it is of vastly more significance than the political issues involved, serious as those may be.

Very sincerely,

(2) that with regard to the Oberlin College rumor, he himself had gone to Oberlin and found that no question had ever been raised in any way as to my dismissal from Oberlin College, and (3) as to my attitude on the race question, I could only submit to him some of my writings and claim that my position was no different from that of other sociologists and anthropologists. That since my chosen field was that of nationalism and race, it was necessary for me to go to the laboratories where the activities in these matters were going on, and I had entered into them in many parts of the world.

It is my personal opinion that the race issue underlies much of the animus against me.

The press has suggested that the real cause of the decision of the Board of Trustees has been my activity against compulsory military training. I have not advised with the students on the matter in any way, but when they asked me to speak at their mass meeting I accepted so as to register myself on their side. In my speech I put emphasis very briefly on educational inconsistency of compulsory thinking in an institution where the stress is laid upon independent thinking. The President attended this meeting and at the close of the meeting himself said to a fellow faculty member that it had been a good meeting. I also spoke on the matter in two faculty meetings.

but whatever I may have said on those occasions seems to me in no way to be pertinent.

My approach to national and racial questions has always been scientific, and I invite a thorough investigation of my utterances both within and without the University.

Yours sincerely,
(signed) Herbert A. Miller

APPENDIX H

June 3, 1931

President G. W. Rightmire,
Administration Building,
Ohio State University

My dear President Rightmire:

Your letter of May 28 is at hand replying to the letter of Dean Weidler and myself requesting that you furnish us the reasons assigned by the Board of Trustees for the dismissal of Dr. Miller. We read these reasons in the daily papers, however, in your report with the Board of Trustees of May 27, 1931, the day after our communication was mailed to you.

Early in July, 1930, I learned unofficially that the Board of Trustees in an earlier meeting held that year had taken some action with reference to Dr. Miller. Shortly after that, I, as Chairman of the Department of Sociology, went to your office and requested that I be permitted to know if the Board of Trustees had taken any action with reference to Dr. Miller, and if so, what the action was. I inferred that Dr. Miller's name was mentioned in the Board meeting but you refused then to discuss the matter or to say if any action was taken. You stated that you would discuss some things with me concerning Dr. Miller early in the autumn.

Late in September, Dean Weidler told me that in response to an inquiry from him you had just informed him that Dr. Miller would have to go at the close of the academic year 1930-31, and that you were directed by the Board of Trustees to notify Dr. Miller of this as soon as he returned from abroad.

But, according to your recent report, the action taken by the Board to dismiss Dr. Miller at the close of the academic year 1930-31 was taken on May 13, 1930. But Dean Weidler and myself knew nothing of the action of the Board of Trustees officially until four months after

action was taken by the Board and then only as a result of inquiries that we initiated. We are told, moreover, that "the decision in the case of Dr. Miller was arrived at after careful consideration," but this "careful consideration" did not involve any reference of the matter to the Dean of the College or the Chairman of the Department where Dr. Miller teaches.

I secured an appointment with you as early as possible after I learned from Dean Weidler that you were directed by the Board to tell Dr. Miller that he would not be employed after the close of the academic year 1930-31.

In this conference which was held in the latter part of September, as I recall, you gave me the reasons assigned by the Board at its meeting on May 13, 1930, for its action on the dismissal of Dr. Miller.

You stated that some of the Board desired action to dismiss him at once; that this was not done but that the Board agreed to dismiss him at the end of the academic year 1930-31. You stated that some member of the Board had read in the *Ohio State Journal* a statement concerning a speech delivered by Dr. Miller in Bombay shortly before this and because of the character of this speech the Board took action with reference to Dr. Miller. You stated also that someone said that at the time we employed Dr. Miller that he was disliked at Oberlin, and was about to lose his position there. It was also said that there were objections to his teaching here especially on the race question.

You will recall that I told you of the conditions and circumstances of Dr. Miller's appointment in 1924 which was in the administration of Dr. Thompson, and that the charges that he was about to lose his position at Oberlin were absolutely without foundation. I told you, moreover, that I had never heard any objections to Dr. Miller's teachings, and that if you had narrated the contents of Dr. Miller's speech at Bombay correctly, the Trustees were not warranted in dismissing him, and that if they did so, it would be a serious infringement on freedom of speech. I called to your attention the case of the dismissal of Dr. Edward A. Ross from Stanford University in the late nineties by the Board of Trustees of that University because the teachings of Dr. Ross did not coincide with the views of the donors of the University and that Stanford University did not recover from this for more than a quarter of a century.

At the close of our conference you stated that you would confer with a number of prominent professors in the University concerning the wisdom of the policy of dismissing Dr. Miller. My understand-

ing of the situation is that not one of these men approved the policy of dismissing Dr. Miller when they heard the case as you stated it. I was also informed by Dean Weidler that he had conferred with you and that he had expressed his disapproval of the proposed action.

At my next conference with you I learned that you were making a thorough investigation of the case. When this investigation was completed you turned over to me a clipping from the *Ohio State Journal* containing the item referring to the Bombay speech with the statement that this was all there was to the charges against Dr. Miller. Judging Dr. Miller's speech from this report it is difficult to see how anyone could find any fault with it, and you apparently felt this way about it at the time.

You stated that you had visited Oberlin College and found that the rumors with reference to Dr. Miller's leaving Oberlin were false. You stated that you had communicated with the State Department in Washington and learned that they had no record there of any complaint made concerning Dr. Miller's speech in India. You said that inquiries had been made of the *New York Times* and the *London Times* and that neither of these papers had any record of Dr. Miller's speech in Bombay. You stated also that you were reading Dr. Miller's book, "Races, Nations and Classes," and that you had found nothing in this book which was radical or objectionable.

Dean Weidler has stated that he conferred with you at approximately the same time and his recollection of this interview was substantially the same as my own.

From all this must we not conclude that the Board of Trustees dismissed Dr. Miller and then investigated his case afterward? Are we not, moreover, forced to conclude that the Board was unwilling to accept the results of the President's investigation, and stood by their original action in finally dismissing Dr. Miller?

After you completed your investigation, I inferred from everything you said that you did not believe that the Board of Trustees had a good case against Dr. Miller, and that you intended to do everything you could do to prevent his dismissal.

In your report with the Board of Trustees of May 27, 1931, you say "it was reported that he (Dr. Miller) had been escorted by the Japanese police from a public meeting in Korea where he was making an address on matters forbidden by the Japanese authorities." Was this item before the Board of Trustees at its meeting of May 13,

1930? In our conferences within the last year you never mentioned this Korea incident to me. In the absence of any other information, it seems to me that we will have to accept Dr. Miller's statement that he was not escorted from the meeting by Japanese police and that he was asked to refrain from speaking only when he stated that a republic had been successful.

With reference to Dr. Miller's Bombay speech you quote Dr. Miller's statement of what he said. Then you say, "The evidence is, however, that he said a great deal more." Then you quote from the *Bombay Chronicle*. This does not differ essentially from the statement of Dr. Miller nor the report in the *Ohio State Journal*. There is certainly nothing in the report which warrants the conclusions you draw; namely, that "here was an American professor, an employee of the university of a state whose nation was at peace with Great Britain, helping to incite the Hindus to civil disobedience." It certainly takes some imagination to visualize anything in that speech inciting "the Hindus to civil disobedience."

Your report says that "From his very first year here, complaints were received from the parents of students in his classes and from others about his teaching on the relations of the races and on domestic relations. As long ago as 1927 serious question arose in the Board of Trustees about re-engaging him because of these increasing complaints."

None of these complaints ever came to me or to Dean Weidler. If the Board of Trustees seriously considered dismissing him as early as 1927 because of these increasing complaints, why was all this information concealed from me, the Chairman of the Department of Sociology, where Dr. Miller taught for a period of over four years, and further why was his dismissal concealed from me and the dean of the college for over four months after the Board of Trustees had voted to dismiss him?

Mr. President, I submit the following questions:

1. Do you believe that a man of professorial rank should be dismissed without consulting his department chairman or the Dean?
2. Did the Board of Trustees request your judgment on the dismissal of Dr. Miller on May 13, 1930, at which time they agreed that his contract would not be renewed at the end of the year?
3. If you did not recommend his dismissal, did you approve of his dismissal then?
4. If the decision in the case of Dr. Miller was arrived at in May.

1930 after "careful consideration," why did you make another investigation of Dr. Miller's case within the last year?

5. Was another investigation made subsequent to your investigation, and if so, who inspired this investigation?

6. Did you recommend the dismissal of Dr. Miller at the meeting of the Board, May 20, 1931, or if you did not, did you approve of the action of the Board of that date dismissing him?

I was brought to the Ohio State University thirty years ago to organize the work in sociology. Although I have been diverted from time to time to other services, serving nineteen years as head of the Department of Economics and Sociology and ten years as Dean of the College of Commerce and Administration, I have from the beginning taught courses in sociology. I have always held tenaciously to the ambition to organize at the Ohio State University one of the strongest departments of sociology in the country. Today in many respects it is second to none in the United States. I consequently view with unspeakable disappointment the destruction to an unknown extent of the work of thirty years by a single course of ill-considered action. Will any reputable scholar now come to the department of sociology or any other department of the Ohio State University?

Very respectfully,

(Signed) J. E. Hagerty

APPENDIX I

Extract from Ohio State Journal, March 13, 1930.

GANDHI HELPED BY PROFESSOR AT OHIO STATE

*Dr. Herbert A. Miller Addresses Hindus Fighting British Rule;
World Sees, He Says*

London, Mar. 12.—A Reuter's dispatch from Bombay, Wednesday, said the start of the civil disobedience campaign was wound up by a mass meeting, Wednesday evening, which was addressed among others by Dr. Herbert A. Miller, professor of sociology at Ohio State University, who is touring India with his wife.

In the course of his remarks Dr. Miller said the whole world was keenly watching Mahatma Gandhi's novel experiment and that he felt the movement was characteristic of India's history.

The great contribution of India during the past thousand years has been religion, he said, and what the movement was intended

to do now was to apply religion to the solution of two great problems, namely, the settling of Indian internal differences and the practical political question. The success of the movement would be the greatest contribution India has ever made to human affairs, he said.

APPENDIX K

Extract from Columbus Citizen, May 26, 1931.

JULIUS STONE MUM ON OUSTING OF PROFESSOR

President George W. Rightmire, Julius F. Stone, Chairman of the Board of Trustees, and other university officials refused to comment Tuesday on Dr. Miller's statement or dismissal.

"The President's letter to Professor Miller speaks for itself," Mr. Stone said.

Mrs. Alma Wacker Patterson, 367 W. Sixth Avenue, Vice-chairman of the Board of Trustees, declined to comment and referred inquiries to Mr. Stone and to James E. Pollard, director of the University news bureau.

Two members of the board made brief statements.

Egbert H. Mack, Sandusky, said: "I voted against the rehiring of Dr. Miller for various reasons. The chief reason was that his statement to Dr. Rightmire of what he had said before the 6000 Gandhi followers in Bombay last year did not check with what he really said."

Harry A. Caton, Coshocton, said: "I prefer not to say how I voted. The charges were in connection with his speech at Bombay. There was some other stuff, too." Asked who brought the charges against Dr. Miller, Caton replied: "Ask Mr. Mack."

Herbert S. Atkinson, 410 S. Columbia Avenue, said that when any statement was made it would be from the Trustees as a whole and would be announced by Stone, the Board's chairman.

Lawrence E. Laybourne, Springfield, declined to comment, and John Kaiser, Marietta, the seventh member of the board, could not be reached.

The term of a member of the board of trustees is seven years. Their terms all expire on May 14 of the following years, as designated:

Stone, 1937; Mrs. Patterson, 1933; Atkinson, 1934; Mack, 1935; Kaiser, 1936; Laybourne, 1938, and Caton, 1932.

LOCAL AND CHAPTER NOTES

UNIVERSITY OF BUFFALO, NEW CURRICULUM

In 1923 the Faculty of Arts and Sciences, after having graduated only three classes from the University of Buffalo, voted to make available for upperclassmen of superior ability those facilities for independent study and investigation which have come to be known as honors courses. From the very beginning, however, this work was conducted on a somewhat different plane from that in vogue at most other colleges. The name was not entirely apt, for the work was neither entirely organized in courses nor yet on the same basis as the honors work in English universities from which it originally took its name. In effect a curriculum was made for each student; there have never during these eight years been courses required of all upperclassmen alike, with a group system and elaborate regulations regarding majors and minors.

The establishment of honors courses was, however, only a part of the far-reaching legislation of 1923. In addition, it was then voted to place as soon as possible the work of the last two years (senior college) entirely on the honors, or individual basis, and to accept into this division of the institution only those students who were willing and able to follow such a program. Each year substantial progress has been made toward this end, until in the winter of 1931 the college decided that the time had come to give effect to the faculty action in its entirety and to place the whole senior college on this basis. In the process the work, although perhaps not the connotation, of "honors" naturally gives way to the designation "tutorial," because each student deemed worthy to enter the senior college is given individual treatment, instead of reserving such preference for a minority. There has been, however, so far no change in the regulations governing the passage of a student from sophomore to junior year.

The Tutorial Plan

To be admitted to the Senior College, students must have completed 64 semester hours, or 32 year hours, of regular course work. No student who has received grades below C in more than fifty per cent of his courses in the Junior College will be admitted to the Senior College. Deficiencies may be made up in the Summer Session preceding the junior year. The Tutorial Committee is

given power to deal with exceptional cases, to be confirmed by faculty action.

Each student desiring to enter the Senior College is required to choose before March of his sophomore year some one department, or two allied departments, as his field of concentration. He must then secure the written consent of the department or departments in question to accept him as a tutorial student. An instructor will be delegated by the department in which his major work is to be done, to serve as tutor and adviser. The tutor, in consultation with the student, will prepare an outline plan of work covering two years and leading to graduation.

The tutorial plan does not contemplate the elimination from the Senior College of regular courses of the traditional type (though their number will probably be decreased), but a combination of course work and tutorial work. In effect, a separate curriculum is organized for each student. The relative amounts of course work and tutorial work to be done by any student are not prescribed in advance, except that, to prevent over-specialization, juniors are required to take at least twelve semester hours of course work outside their field of concentration, and seniors to take at least six semester hours work outside their field.

Graduation will be contingent upon grades secured in (1) regular courses and (2) a final comprehensive examination in the field or fields of concentration. The student is expected to develop habits of independent work, reading, and writing under tutorial direction, choosing his own time and manner of working, doing as much as his ambition and ability make possible, and reporting to his tutor at least once a week for criticism and suggestion. The University of Buffalo has taken the position that the degree of bachelor of arts should be conferred only on those who have demonstrated the capacity for independent, creative work.

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY, ATHLETIC POLICIES

"... In adopting this report the Trustees accepted the principle that intercollegiate athletics are a proper and necessary part of the program of activities of an undergraduate college, and that it is an obligation of the University to see that intercollegiate athletics are conducted and properly controlled as part of the work of Columbia College. A Director of Athletics is to be appointed by the President who shall have full University standing and who, under the direc-

tion of the President, will have final control of the athletic program of the University. He will be a member of the Department of Physical Education and will work in cooperation with the University Committee on Athletics. The existing University Committee on Athletics is to be increased by the addition of the Treasurer of the University, the Dean of Columbia College, and two Trustees of the University. There will be appointed immediately a Controller of Athletics with full power to pass upon and limit the budgets of all sports. The Controller will be directed to cooperate with the University Committee on Athletics and to revise the budgets of all sports so far as may be consistent with present contract commitments. The purpose is, as speedily as may be, to bring the expenditures in connection with athletic contests into harmony with the general scale of salaries and expenditures prevailing throughout the University.

"In particular it is hoped and expected that the emphasis that is now placed upon gate receipts from football contests will be brought to an end and that the cost of the athletic work of the University may be met by the income from permanent endowments given to the University for that purpose.

"At Columbia there will no longer be any distinction between the work of the Department of Physical Education and the inter-collegiate athletic contests. These will all be assimilated under one direction, one management, and one set of standards, financial and academic. . . ."

MASSACHUSETTS INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY, COMPREHENSIVE EXAMINATIONS IN ELECTRICAL ENGINEERING

The comprehensive examination as conceived by the Department has four distinctive features: (1) the examination is one covering electrical engineering as a professional field rather than one dealing principally with the details of individual subjects or comprehensively with any one subject; (2) the examination consists therefore primarily of a number of questions (perhaps ten for any individual student) of a semi-project nature each more or less comprehensive in itself, that is, in one problem may be involved the application of principles of mechanics, thermodynamics, hydraulics or economics, as well as principles of electricity and magnetism, interwoven in the fashion naturally found in practice rather than artificially isolated; (3) adequate time (the major portion of two weeks) is allowed for

preparing the answers so that they may be the result of reflection and mature thought rather than of hasty and incomplete analysis; and, (4) an oral session is held subsequent to the reading of the papers, at which time the examiners may question the students further as a consequence of the written answers given, following which general discussion relating to the examination problems and to the summing-up of the purposes, utility, and success of the examination procedure is in order.

The examination is set by a committee consisting of three members invited from industry and other engineering schools and two members selected from the Department staff. It covers all of the professional work of the junior and senior years together with its scientific foundation. It is designed to test the understanding of principles and the ability to carry the reasoning therefrom through to a finish, rather than the ability to solve problems by analogy to familiar classroom or textbook forms. Emphasis is therefore placed upon analysis and judgment rather than upon memory. Reference is permitted to texts, handbooks, periodicals, or any other sources of information desired, though each student's work must, of course, be individual.

Though the examination is comprehensive in scope, it should not be thought of as general or superficial rather than exact and searching in nature. The problems appearing in it require a deeper understanding of basic principles and more exacting analysis than those in the usual term examinations.

The use of comprehensive examinations in the Department has thus far been limited to the students of the Senior Honors Group, which averages about eighteen men per year and varies from class to class from about ten to twenty-five.

Though the comprehensive examination has been employed only for students of the Honors Groups, the plan is not carried on as an isolated feature of the Department's processes. It is carried on in association with and gains considerable support from the practice of grouping the students into small teaching sections, in accordance with their observed mental speeds and capacities, so that each student finds himself in a group of relative mental homogeneity in which the mode of instruction is designed to meet his needs. The arrangement is flexible, however, for a student may be transferred from one section to another or may be given the opportunity of becoming an honors group student, in accordance with his progress and performance. Hence the comprehensive examination is a potential

influence upon every scholarly and ambitious student in the Department.

The results of the comprehensive examination as a measure of achievement have been very good. Though no formal honors are awarded to students whose comprehensive examinations are of high quality, most of the papers have been very satisfactory, and none could be considered failures. While the present status of the comprehensive examination is of too recent date to permit conclusions to be drawn relating to its influence upon habits of study, the situation is very encouraging. The first two years in which comprehensive examinations were tried, the honors group students took them voluntarily in addition to their other examinations, as a matter of interest in testing themselves, and to cooperate with the Department for the purpose of experiment. The students do not, in general, fear the comprehensive examination, but (on the contrary) favor it and its associated intent.

UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA, CHAPTER ACTIVITIES

At the last meeting of the current year sixty members were present.

"Besides following our custom of having a program appropriate to the occasion, we discussed the matter of improvement of college teaching. It was a very effective program in that it emphasized the two great fields of work; namely, research and teaching. I think I can justly say that the idea of introducing professional training courses for prospective college teachers is not looked upon favorably by several of the departments here.

"You will be interested to know some of our other program subjects for the year. At one meeting we discussed academic freedom. At another we had a debate between two members from the school of Education and two members from departments in the College of Arts and Sciences, on the relative values of subject matter courses and courses in Pedagogy in the training of High School teachers. Another meeting was devoted to a consideration of the problem of entrance requirements and the possible restricted selection of University Freshmen. Our speaker for the evening was the Chief High School Inspector of the State Board of Education."

UNIVERSITY OF OREGON, GROUP INSURANCE

For a long time the University of Oregon has realized that a large number of its faculty are inadequately protected by insurance, in

spite of the fact that a large number carry policies with the Teachers Insurance and Annuity Association of America and other standard companies.

Group insurance, toward which the institution should contribute a considerable part, suggested itself as a promising plan to meet the difficulty of providing adequate protection at a cost so low as to be within the reach of all.

Accordingly, the experience of the other institutions of the country with group life insurance, group disability insurance, and group death and dismemberment insurance was sought.

The questionnaire was sent to nearly all the state universities of the United States and Canada, together with a large number of the leading privately endowed institutions. Fifty-nine institutions have replied. Of these, twenty-nine, or practically one-half, have some plan of group insurance in force; seventeen, more than one-half the remainder, are considering it; and only thirteen show no interest. The replies indicate that the results are very much more satisfactory when the institution makes a material contribution to the cost.

The replies show a surprisingly strong movement toward group insurance during the past five years on the part of our educational institutions; quite as strong relatively as in the business and industrial world, where many billions of group insurance are now in force. Group life insurance has been thoroughly tested and put on a sound basis and is now accepted by both the business and educational worlds.

In answer to a letter from the writer, a paragraph in the reply of President James W. Glover, the new head of the Teachers Insurance and Annuity Association of America, is very significant. He says, "I note you are interested in group insurance for the University of Oregon Faculty and regret to advise that *up to the present time this association has not completed plans to enter this field. I am interested in the subject, however, and it is possible we may do something of this kind before long.*"

The italics are my own.

Following up the letter quoted, President Hall, of the University of Oregon, has written recently to President Glover, urging the association to enter the field of group insurance, as its next great service to the colleges and universities of the country. The association is in a position to reduce present costs very materially by the elimination of all overhead expense.

The insurance committee of the University of Oregon believes that the insurance needs of our faculty and administration include adequate life insurance for the protection of family and dependents during the period of actual service, followed by an annuity on retirement. The university has generously assisted its members in making provision for annuities. It now proposes a three-fold plan of group insurance; namely, group life insurance, for which it assumes approximately one-half the cost, together with group accident and health insurance and group death and dismemberment insurance paid for wholly by the faculty. This plan is very similar to the one now in force at Teachers College, Columbia University. Our investigation has led us to the following conclusions:

(1) Group life insurance is sound, inexpensive, and is rapidly becoming an established policy of our leading educational institutions.

(2) The cost should be met by approximately equal contributions by the institution and the members of the group; which is now the accepted policy for our annuity systems.

(3) Group accident and health insurance and group death and dismemberment insurance should be used to supplement the group life insurance, thus forming with the annuity system a complete plan of protection.

(4) The time has come for the Teachers Insurance and Annuity Association of America to take its next great step forward and enter the field of group insurance for college professors. By doing so it will relieve the profession of all overhead costs and give it the benefit of the low mortality among college professors; thus providing the needed protection at a cost far below that now available.

School and Society, vol. xxxiii, no. 855

TULANE, RURAL HEALTH EDUCATION

Tulane University, New Orleans, will undertake an extensive program of rural health education in the state of Mississippi as a result of funds approximating half a million dollars made available by the Commonwealth Fund.

Mississippi was one of the three states in the Union chosen by directors of the fund in which to carry out a health service program. Direct results of the agreement with the Commonwealth Fund will mean the opening at Tulane University for the first time next fall of

a *department of preventive medicine*; the establishing of *five free scholarships* each year for undergraduate medical students from Mississippi and the offering of *post-graduate courses on a fellowship* basis to practicing Mississippi physicians at the Tulane graduate school of medicine.

To further carry out the work of preventive medicine, two counties in Mississippi—Lauderdale and Pike—have been selected as headquarters for the concentration of rural health activities. In these counties, a program of well organized rural health service will be carried out by a competent organization in cooperation with the physicians of the counties, according to Dr. C. C. Bass, dean of the Tulane medical school. Among other things, the country physicians will be given an opportunity to go to Tulane for post-graduate courses planned especially to prepare them to give better health service in their practice. The public health work in these counties which is separate from the medical educational part of the general program at Tulane will be fostered by the Mississippi health department of which Dr. F. J. Underwood is director.

Each year, 15 Mississippi physicians will be sent to the graduate school to take practical courses of instruction over a period of four months on a fellowship basis. In order to enable them to leave their practices, the Commonwealth Fund will take care of their tuition at the school, will make allowances for their travel to and from New Orleans, and will give them \$250 a month besides. The selection of the graduate students will be entirely in the hands of the Mississippi state health department and the representatives of the Commonwealth Fund. The scholarships will be awarded to those students selected by the Tulane school of medicine from among the qualified applicants from Mississippi. There are nearly 40 applicants this year.

The five free scholarships will provide each under-graduate student with \$1200 a year for a period of four years. Recipients of these scholarships are required to agree to return to Mississippi after their graduation, take up one or two years of interne work and practice at least three years in some rural community of the state.

COMMUNICATIONS

PROFESSORIAL EFFICIENCY AND THE SLIDING SALARY SCALE

From a member of the Association

It seems to me that the long battle for tenure is definitely decided, thanks largely to the vigorous policy of the Association. . . . But the victory seems to me almost too complete, and to carry the germ of real trouble. . . . Some members of the faculty are of no value whatsoever to the institution. In frequent cases they are the source of positive harm. . . . The real problem is, of course, in connection with the old members of the faculty, who have been unable or unwilling to maintain their efficiency.

I believe a satisfactory basis for compromise can be found, provided administrations and faculties have courage. In any well adjusted economic scheme, a man's salary should be at a maximum during the period of his greatest usefulness, be this toward the end of his life's work, or at an earlier stage. I should like to see every professor appointed with a fair minimum salary which is guaranteed. Everything beyond this minimum should have the character of a bonus, which is awarded for a limited number of years, perhaps three or five. I should think that we might have many cases of the following *schematic* type:

Appointed Professor at age 40:	40-43—\$4000 minimum
	43-48— 5000
	48-55— 6000
	55-60— 5000
	60-65— 4000.

In some cases, the salary will increase until the end of service; in others, it may after moderate increases rather soon drop back to the minimum. Nobody would have a right to expect that the bonus be continued beyond the period stipulated; it would be clearly understood that it is a question of rewarding those whose services to their university happen to be of greatest value during a certain time, and no disgrace should normally be attached to a decrease or discontinuance of the bonus.

It would be asking too much to expect an administration to carry unaided the responsibility of handling so delicate a machinery. There should be a small advisory body of leading members of the faculty to assist the administration and to frankly share responsibility.

It is my impression that in many institutions such a method could be introduced without legally interfering with the present type of contract.

This plan would furnish a dignified stimulus, would make possible a more fair distribution of available funds, and would eliminate much of the feeling of injustice which exists in the faculty at large when some men receive salaries which they clearly do not deserve.

A PROBLEM OF TENURE

From a College President

Dear Mr. Tyler:

Has the A. A. U. P. considered how some of the regulations or suggestions concerning tenure which may be excellent for a large institution may not be wise practice in a small institution?

Suppose a college has a faculty of twenty, as a few hundred colleges have, and a professor has proven himself unsatisfactory to the Board of Trustees, to the faculty, and to the President. Suppose it is a case of an ineffective personality. If such a professor is given a year's notice, he would be able to spoil the atmosphere of the college for a year. In a small college the relation of faculty members to each other and to students is so close that disharmony is fatal to the effectiveness and usefulness of the college. To keep a disaffected professor for a year may cause untold damage to the college.

In protecting the professor's tenure the A. A. U. P. is doing a fine work, but is there not danger of making smaller colleges where personal relations are of tremendous importance undergo a year of disharmony and discord whenever some professor who has failed to give a reasonable satisfaction has to be replaced?

Dear President —:

I am obliged for your interesting note about the relation between tenure conditions and the size of the institution. The point you make has come to our attention, of course, though, so far as I am aware, no attempt has been made to work out a differential general treatment. I think, in dealing with particular cases, we have not infrequently taken this factor into account. Of course, we recognize that protection against arbitrary dismissal should not carry with it any assurance of permanency for incompetent teachers, and I have,

as I write this, an interesting proposal from one of our members that, in recognition of the frequency with which efficiency reaches a maximum in the middle years and then gradually declines, there should be a corresponding adjustment of salaries.

We venture to hope that one good reaction of our efforts to guard against hasty dismissal will be increased care in appointments and promotions. As to the specific question of length of notice of dismissal, you will see by the enclosed leaflet that we recognize the admissibility of notice considerably less than a year. We have in mind also the fact that in many cases the small institution must give a teacher a higher rank than he would have in a large university and that this fact should not be overlooked in connection with tenure problems.

Very truly yours,

H. W. Tyler, *General Secretary*

MEMBERSHIP

ACTIVE MEMBERS ELECTED

The Committee on Admission announces the election of three hundred and forty-eight active and one hundred and thirty-four junior members, as follows:

University of Akron, Donald Anthony, John W. Bulger, Walter Cook, George L. Hayes, Walter C. Kraatz, Raymond B. Pease, Roy V. Sherman, Rodney A. Slagg; **Alabama Polytechnic Institute**, D. Claire Harkin; **University of Alabama**, George I. Adams, Edward A. Boyden, Herman H. Chapman, Carroll R. Daugherty, E. W. Gregory, Jr., James Halladay, Agnes E. Harris, Berwind P. Kaufmann, Robert I. Little, Whitley P. McCoy, Edgar L. Morphet, H. C. Pannell, Clarence M. Pruitt, Ethel J. Saxman, V. M. Sims, Septima Smith, Marcus Whitman, E. Baskin Wright; **Albright College**, F. Wilbur Gingrich; **Antioch College**, Merrill L. Dawson, Erna Jullig-Broda, Perry Mason; **Arizona State Teachers' College**, Waldo B. Christy; **University of Arizona**, Lathrop E. Roberts; **Arkansas State Teachers College**, Dean D. McBrien; **University of Arkansas**, Roy W. Roberts; **Baldwin-Wallace College**, Marie C. Burns, Delo C. Grover; **Beloit College**, G. B. P. Schick, Lewis E. Severson; **Bethany College**, Florence M. Foster; **Birmingham-Southern College**, Theodore S. Eckert; **Boston University**, Edwin P. Booth; **Bradley Polytechnic Institute**, Bennett M. Hollowell; **Brooklyn College**, Frederick E. Breithut, J. D. Clarkson, Mario E. Cosenza, Thomas E. Coulton, Oscar F. W. Fernsemer, Edward Fleisher, J. Redding Kelly, Robert B. MacDougall, Martin Meyer, Charlotte E. Morgan, Richard J. O'Neil, John J. Spagnoli, Donald G. Whiteside; **Brown University**, Dudley Jyng, Harold Schlosling; **University of Buffalo**, Robert E. McClendon; **California State Teachers' College**, Leo F. Pierce; **University of California (L. A.)**, Marshall E. Dimock; **Carson and Newman College**, Judson D. Ives, Franklin T. Walker; **Catawba College**, Victor F. Murray; **Centre College**, Thomas E. Cochran; **University of Chicago**, Martin Sprengling; **The City College (New York)**, Harold H. Abelson, Howard G. Bohlin, John Bridge, Arthur Dickson, Morton Gottschall, Samuel Joseph, Fay Null; **Colgate University**, Jason A. Russell; **Colorado State Teachers' College (Western)**, Lois B. Borland, James S. Ferris, P. E. Leavenworth; **University of Colorado**, Benjamin S. Galland, G. Arnold Logan, Therese Stengel; **Columbia University**, James W. Angell, R. M. MacIves; **Connecticut Agricultural College**, Charles R. Gentry, Walter L. Kulp, George H. Lamson, Albert E. Moss, Howard A. Seckerson, George S. Torrey; **Converse College**, Hazel Abbott; **Cornell University**, John James Elson, Carleton C. Murdock; **Culver-Stockton College**, Harold E. Briggs, Henry Harmon, L. S. Hopkins, Byron Ingold, George Manifold, Henry B. Robison, William V. Roosa, William E. Schultz; **Dalhousie University**, Hugh P. Bell; **Dartmouth College**, Ralph A. Burns; **University of Denver**, Linda M. Clatworthy; **Drake University**, Fannie Malone; **Drury College**, Martha P. Jane; **Duke University**, W. Bryan Bolich, Allen H. Godbey, Clarence Gohdes, Julia Grout, Karl E. Zener; **Elmira College**, Elmer W. K. Mould; **Evansville College**, Alvin Strickler; **Fairmont State Normal School**, Mary B.

Gibson, Maud Hull, Ethel Ice, Louise Leonard, Edna Richmonds, Oliver Shurtleff; **George Peabody College for Teachers**, Milton L. Shane; **George Washington University**, W. Phelps Thomas; **Gettysburg College**, Jesse S. Boughton; **Greensboro College**, George K. Hibbets; **Grinnell College**, Joseph W. Charlton, Isabelle Clark, Luella J. Read; **Hanover College**, Marie Garten; **Harris Teachers College**, Mendel E. Branom, Charles G. Vannest; **Hood College**, Mildred B. Northrop; **Hunter College**, Mary F. Higgins, Renata Remy, Frida von Unwerth; **Illinois State Normal University (Southern)**, W. Elizabeth Burk, Edgar A. Holt; **Immaculata College**, Oran Raber; **Indiana State Teachers College**, Bessie Noyes; **Iowa State College of A. and M.**, Millard Peck, Edna M. Rhoads, Alice Waugh; **University of Iowa**, Mason Ladd, Paul L. Sayre, Harry E. Stinson, Harold M. Williams; **Jamestown College**, Harry B. Hart; **Juniata College**, Svea M. Anderson, Warren D. Bowman, May Elizabeth Keirns, Martha Pilger; **Kansas State Agricultural College**, Harrison B. Summers; **Kentucky State Teachers' College (Eastern)**, Homer E. Cooper; **University of Kentucky**, T. M. Hahn; **Kenyon College**, Bruce H. Redditt; **Knox College**, Alfred W. Newcombe; **Lafayette College**, Paul B. Eaton, Charles W. Harris, Harry A. Itter; **Louisiana Polytechnic Institute**, Pearl Hogrefe; **Louisiana State University**, Annie T. Bell, Earl L. Bradsher, J. T. Broussard, A. R. Choppin, Rigney D'Aunoy, Ernest A. Fieger, Carleton Liddle, M. G. Osborn, B. W. Pegues, Frederick F. Pillet, Madison B. Sturgis; **University of Louisville**, Robert D. Johnston; **McKendree College**, Claude E. Vick; **Meredith College**, Thelma MacIntyre; **Miami University**, Read Bain, P. K. Whelpton; **Michigan State Normal College**, C. L. Anspach, Simon E. Fagerstrom, Luther R. Moffitt, H. L. Turner; **University of Michigan**, Roy H. Gearhart; **University of Minnesota**, Joseph Valasek; **Missouri State Teachers College (Southeast)**, Harold O. Grauel; **Missouri State Teachers College (Southwest)**, Mary C. Keith, Sue Scott Perkins; **University of Missouri**, John Q. Adams, Russell Bauder, Thomas A. Brady, Mildred W. Brown, Charles H. Butler, M. Hermond Cochran, Elmer Ellis, Leslie Fahrner, Sinclair Kerby-Miller, Charles F. Mullett, Elmer Wood; **Moorhead State Teachers College (Minn.)**, Clifford P. Archer, Margaret E. Bieri, Samuel G. Bridges, Arnold M. Christensen, Flora M. Frick, Ella A. Hawkinson, Joseph Kise, Katharine Leonard, Byron D. Murray, Ole R. Sande, Joseph R. Schwendeman, Henry B. Weltzin, Matilda Williams; **Morehead State Teachers College (Kentucky)**, Roy E. Graves; **Nebraska Wesleyan University**, Claude Kinnick; **University of New Hampshire**, Alma D. Jackson, Theodore R. Meyers; **University of New Mexico**, J. W. Diefendorf; **College of New Rochelle**, Sylvester J. Hemleben, Anna T. Sheedy; **New York University**, Carl T. Chase, Benjamin B. Gamzue, Nelson W. McCombs, Stephen W. Nile, Margaret Schlauch, Donald Snedden, George B. Vetter; **North Carolina State College**, Joseph D. Clark, Leon E. Cook, R. O. Moen; **University of North Carolina**, W. A. Olsen, G. Wallace Smith; **University of North Dakota**, Margaret K. Cable, Alexis J. Diakoff, Edith W. Kay, Elmer C. Koch, Jacob Perlman, John J. Rellahan, A. M. Rovellstad; **Northwestern University**, Edward W. Morehouse; **Ohio Wesleyan University**, M. Pearl Lloyd; **Oklahoma A. and M. College**, Grace Fernandes, John C. Muerman, Herman W. Smith; **Oklahoma College for Women**, Ruth W. Pray; **Oregon State Agricultural College**, Othniel R. Chambers, Mary E. Lewis; **University of Pennsylvania**, Luther Harr, Walter W. Lucasse, S. Howard Patterson; **University of Pittsburgh**, J. C. Charlesworth, S. B. Davis, John J. Geise, George K.

McCabe, John H. McFadden, Clarke Olney, Scott W. Smith, Robert V. Young; Pomona College, Dedrich Navall; Presbyterian College of South Carolina, James F. Koehler; Princeton University, Robert G. Albion; Purdue University, Marie Darst; Rhode Island State College, H. Louis Jackson, Helen E. Peck, Robert Rockafellow; University of Rochester, Fred G. Bratton; Rollins College, Herman F. Harris; Rutgers University, M. Louise Finney; St. Cloud State Teachers College, John C. Cochrane, George W. Friedrich, John R. McCrory, Emanuel M. Paulu, Leslie D. Zeleny; St. John's College, Ford K. Brown, George H. McFarlin; St. Lawrence University, John B. Douds, Allen R. Hartzell, Angus H. MacLean, Wilbur T. Meek, Edson R. Miles, Henry Reiff; Sam Houston College, Fay Alexander, Hiawatha Crosslin; Simpson College, Charles N. Burrows, W. C. Hilmer, James H. Inman, Edith Whitaker; Smith College, Dorothy W. Douglas; University of South Carolina, James B. Coleman; South Dakota State Teachers College (Northern), Herbert R. Hiett; University of South Dakota, Gladys E. Leonard; University of Southern California, George L. Doty, Albion R. King; Southern Methodist University, Arthur L. Harding, Franklin K. Rader; Southwestern College (Kansas), Henry W. Taylor; Stout Institute, Ruth E. Michaels; Sweet Briar College, Jessie M. Fraser; Syracuse University, J. W. Hansen, Harold H. Schaff; Tarkio College, Ray D. Nelson, J. Merle Rife; Temple University, Frank H. Eby, R. B. Munson, George K. Schacterle; University of Tennessee, Ralph J. Scanlan; Texas Technological College, A. H. Leidigh, Margaret W. Weeks; University of Texas, Marion Fay; Trinity College, Kenneth S. Buxton; Tufts College, Bruce W. Brotherston, Kendall W. Foster; Union College, Donald L. Burdick, Ernest E. Dale, Russell A. Hall, Ernest M. Lignon, Vladimir Rojansky, Frank J. Studer, D. Richard Weeks; University of Utah, Arthur L. Beeley; Valparaiso University, Howard W. Moody; Vanderbilt University, John H. Moore; Vassar College, M. Alberta Hawes; University of Vermont, Raymond A. Hall; Virginia Military Institute, Carl A. Mendum; Virginia State Teachers College (Farmville), Martin B. Coyner, Raymond H. French, Samuel M. Holton, Jr., Francis B. Simkins; Wabash College, W. Norwood Brigrance; Washington and Lee University, William W. Morton; Washington State Normal College (Cheney), David Barber, Raymond F. Hawk, Ralph E. Tieje; University of Washington, Margaret E. Terrell; Washington University, Robert C. Duncan, Alice C. Schriver; Western Reserve University, John F. Bell, Earl L. Shoup; West Virginia University, Clement C. Fenton; Wheaton College, Eunice Work; Whitman College, Reginald J. Green; William Jewell College, Constantine Bila, Frederick M. Derwacter, John P. Fruit, P. Casper Harvey, Cloice R. Howd, Allen J. Moon, James B. Sullivan; College of William and Mary, W. Melville Jones; University of Wisconsin, Werner Neuse, J. Ortega; Wittenberg College, Frieda Chapman; College of Wooster, James Anderson, Jr., Aileen Dunham; Yale University, George P. Murdock.

JUNIOR MEMBERS ELECTED

Antioch College, Irving W. Burr, Henry Federighi; Brooklyn College, Austin B. Wood; Bryn Mawr College, Edith K. Cumings, Kathryn Wood; California Institute of Technology, C. E. P. Jeffreys; University of California (Berkeley), Esther C. Allen, Earl C. Crockett, Walter E. Rothman; University of Chicago,

Frederick W. Bachmann, Rowland H. Wehmhoff; **The Citadel**, Frank C. Tibbetts; **Columbia University**, Abraham Edel, E. Fronde Kennedy, Charles W. T. Weldon; **Connecticut Agricultural College**, Victor A. Rapport; **Dakota Wesleyan University**, Frank E. August; **Dartmouth College**, M. Taylor Matthews, J. P. Sanders; **College of the City of Detroit**, Agnes H. Houghton; **College of Emporia**, Merlin G. Miller; **University of Florida**, William L. Lowry, Ancil N. Payne, Charles Sellerier; **George Washington University**, Matalee T. Lake; **Grinnell College**, Amy E. Blagg, Gordon Sutherland, Harold S. Wilson; **University of Illinois**, William B. Lockling, Kenneth D. Luney; **Iowa State College**, Bernard Lenrow, Margaret G. Reid, Forest L. Whan; **University of Iowa**, Harry X. Bay, Edward L. Clark, Lawrence E. Eberly, Alpha M. Looney, Ray E. Miller, William J. Petersen; **Johns Hopkins University**, Marion M. E. Broadbent, Geoffrey May, Randall L. Thompson; **Juniata College**, Edward N. Waters; **Lehigh University**, Daniel Harris; **Louisiana State University**, Lloyd V. Funchess; **University of Louisville**, George H. Harding; **McKendree College**, A. Edythe Mange; **Massachusetts Institute of Technology**, Vitaly Sakouta, John P. Vinti; **Meredith College**, Lois A. Pearman; **Michigan State Normal School**, Karl W. Guenther; **Middlebury College**, Miriam A. Turner; **University of Minnesota**, J. Lester Tierney; **University of Missouri**, Royal D. M. Bauer, Harry P. Hartkemeier, Burton Milligan, L. Robert Pepper; **Missouri Valley College**, Richard O. Hale; **University of Montana**, Joseph Kramer; **New York State College for Teachers**, Guy L. Hilleboe; **New York University**, Tate Lindsey; **University of North Carolina**, Ethel M. Chapin, Harry B. Mulkey; **University of North Dakota**, A. V. Overn; **Northwestern University**, C. E. Needham; **Ohio State University**, Rex M. Johnson, Lucile D. Smith; **Ohio University**, M. Lelyn Branin; **Ohio Wesleyan University**, Berniece C. Mead; **Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College**, Nicholas Mikhailovich Oboukhoff, L. S. Stephens; **University of Oregon**, J. Dewitt Davis, Frank J. Roubal; **Otterbein College**, Elinor J. Barnes; **University of Pennsylvania**, B. Murray Gray, Guy S. Klett; **University of Pittsburgh**, Benjamin Gaines; **Princeton University**, Herbert P. Riley, James S. Wishart; **Purdue University**, Moses N. Thisted; **Randolph-Macon Woman's College**, Rose M. Davis; **St. Lawrence University**, Charles W. Lightbody, Charles B. Norman; **Skidmore College**, Eulin P. Klyver; **Smith College**, Virginia Corwin; **Stanford University**, Albert Walton; **Syracuse University**, Mildred L. Bacon, Raymond L. Taylor; **Temple University**, Marion Bell; **University of Tennessee**, Roger P. Matteson; **Texas Technological College**, Charles C. Rodeffer; **University of the City of Toledo**, Maurice M. Lemme; **Tulane University**, Francis H. Wilson; **Union College**, Earle M. Bigsbee, Reinhard H. Senn; **Vanderbilt University**, Marvin A. Bacon; **Medical College of Virginia**, William A. Peabody; **University of Virginia**, George R. Stevens; **State College of Washington**, Manly R. Sackett, Newell R. Ziegler; **Washington University**, Joseph W. Hawthorne; **Wellesley College**, Hannah Hyatt, Elisabeth F. Stevenson; **William Jewell College**, W. Holt Smith; **University of Wyoming**, Lydia Eubank; **Not in University connection**, Edith L. Allen (Ph.D., American University), Washington, D. C.; Jacob A. Baer (Ph.D., Johns Hopkins University), Baltimore, Md.; George R. Berquist (A.B., McMaster University), Midale, Saskatchewan, Canada; Jerome Von B. Coe (A.M., Syracuse University), Baldwinsville, N. Y.; Julian S. Duncan (M.A.,

University of Mississippi), Washington, D. C.; Ruth A. Eckhart (A.M., Boston University), Washington, D. C.; Harry Feld (B.Mus., Eastman School of Music), Rochester, N. Y.; Leon Feraru (Ph.D., Columbia University), Brooklyn, N. Y.; Oscar M. Fogle (Ed.M., Harvard University), Harrogate, Tenn.; Florence M. Foster (Ph.D., Cornell University), Lindsborg, Kansas; Leo Gershoy (Ph.D., Cornell University), Brooklyn, N. Y.; Rubin Gotesky (M.A., New York University), Brooklyn, N. Y.; M. Elizabeth Hartman (Ph.D., University of Nebraska), Harrisburg, Pa.; Arthur C. C. Hill, Jr. (Ph.D., Brookings Institution), Washington, D. C.; Berthe C. Koch (Ph.D., Ohio State University), Columbus, Ohio; Howard D. Lightbody (Ph.D., University of Michigan), Pittsburgh, Pa.; Richard V. Lott (A.M., University of Missouri), A. and M. College, Mississippi; Mathew Nathanael Lundquist (M.A., St. Bonaventure's College), Oneonta, N. Y.; Elizabeth G. McPherson (M.A., University of North Carolina), Shiloh, North Carolina; Boyd B. Palmer (M.S., University of Illinois), San German, Porto Rico; Rachel A. Palmer (M.A., University of Illinois), San German, Porto Rico; Richard H. Paynter (Ph.D., Ohio State University), New York, N. Y.; Cornelius C. Regier (Ph.D., University of Iowa), Montgomery, W. Va.; Mary Z. Rowland (M.A., Johns Hopkins University), Catonsville, Md.; Theresa E. Schindler (Ph.D., Cornell University), Washington, D. C.; Waldo E. Smith (A.M., University of Illinois), Fargo, N. Dak.; Frances Strakosch (M.A., Columbia University), New York, N. Y.; Richard G. Wallis (A.B., Dartmouth College), Framingham, Mass.; Marion E. Warner (M.A., Wellesley College), Salina, Kansas.

NOMINATIONS FOR MEMBERSHIP

The following two hundred and thirteen nominations for active membership and ninety-eight nominations for junior membership are printed as provided under Article IV of the Constitution. Objection to any nominee may be addressed to the Secretary, 744 Jackson Place, Washington, D. C., or to the Chairman of the Committee on Admissions¹ and will be considered by the Committee if received before November 25, 1931.

The Committee on Admissions consists of Frederick Slocum, Wesleyan, Chairman; W. C. Allee, Chicago; A. L. Bouton, New York; E. S. Brightman, Boston; E. C. Hinsdale, Mt. Holyoke; A. C. Lane, Tufts; A. O. Lovejoy, Johns Hopkins; W. T. Magruder, Ohio State; Julian Park, Buffalo.

Howard C. Abbott (Biology), Evansville
Hugh E. Agnew (Marketing), New York
Helen C. Anderson (English), Southern Oregon Normal
Montgomery D. Anderson (Economics), Florida
Ann Anthony (Education), Hunter
Alfred N. Appleby (Drafting), City of New York
Charles F. Arrowood (Education), Texas
Thomas E. Atkinson (Law), Kansas
Carroll P. Baber (Library), Kansas State Teachers (Emporia)
Thomas F. Ball (Electrical Engineering), South Carolina
Philip W. Barber (Drama), Yale
Bertram D. Barclay (Botany), Tulsa
Gerald Barnes (Sociology), Dickinson
A. S. Barr (Education), Wisconsin
Graham A. Barringer (History), Nebraska Wesleyan
Theodore N. Beckman (Marketing), Ohio State
William N. Beetham (Education), Marshall
Stanard G. Bergquist (Geology), Michigan State
Alice L. Berry (Sociology), Macalester
Helen L. Bishop (Latin), City of Detroit
Frederick O. Bissell, Jr. (English), Cornell
Christopher J. Bittner (Sociology, Economics), McKendree
Elna C. Boecker (Art), Hunter
S. J. Boller (Engineering), Texas Technological
James Brewster (Library), Union
Paul F. Brissenden (Economics), Columbia
Howard L. Bronson (Physics), Dalhousie
M. Eustace Broom (Education), California State Teachers
Edwin J. Brown (Education), Kansas State Teachers (Emporia)

¹ Nominations should in all cases be presented through the Washington Office, 744 Jackson Place, Washington, D. C.

Maynard W. Brown (Journalism), Marquette
Ralph E. Brown (Mechanical Engineering), Rhode Island State
William A. Brown, Jr. (Economics), Brown
R. I. Brumbaugh (Architecture), Washington (St. Louis)
William E. Bruner (Biology), Baker
Anne E. Burlingame (History), Hunter
G. Richard Burns (Chemistry), Yale
Verne V. Caldwell (Psychology), Southern Oregon Normal
Robert C. Cantelo (Chemistry), Cincinnati
Albert M. Capron (Industrial Arts), Western State (Colorado)
Paul Carpenter (Music), Oklahoma
James E. Carver (English), Mt. Holyoke
Charles E. Cayley (History), Trinity
Louis W. Chappell (English), West Virginia
Harvey D. Chase (Zoology), Tulsa
Clarence T. Craig (Bible), Oberlin
Paul G. Cressey (Sociology), Evansville
A. B. Cunningham (English), Texas Technological
George D. Davidson (French), Mississippi Woman's
Harold E. Davis (History), Hiram
Philip H. Davis (Classics), Vassar
Vincent A. Davis (English), Kansas State Teachers (Emporia)
Charles C. Denney (Psychology), Arkansas State Teachers
Harry R. DeSilva (Psychology), Kansas
W. Roy Diem (Speech), Ohio Wesleyan
Franklin G. Dill (Religion), Tulsa
Cornelia M. Downs (Bacteriology), Kansas
Garrett B. Drummond (Mathematics), Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical
Bonnie K. Dysart (Psychology), Texas Technological
Seba Eldridge (Sociology), Kansas
Clarence J. Elmore (Biology), William Jewell
Elmer F. Engel (German), Kansas
Frank A. Ferguson (Physics), Connecticut Agricultural
W. Conrad Fernelius (Chemistry), Ohio State
Fred K. Fleagle (Spanish), Davidson
Felix Flugel (Economics), California (Berkeley)
Henry J. Fry (Biology), New York
Domenico Gagliardo (Economics), Kansas
Leland J. Gordon (Economics), Denison
Roy F. Graesser (Mathematics), Arizona
Claudine Gray (French), Hunter
Richard L. Grider (Mining Engineering), Kansas
Samuel C. Ham (Music), Simpson
J. S. Hamilton (Journalism), Louisiana State
Paul Hansen (Music), Washburn
Robert W. Harbeson (Economics), Iowa State Teachers
J. Penrose Harland (Classics), North Carolina
George R. Harrison (Physics), Massachusetts Institute of Technology

Robert W. Hartley (Mathematics), Southwestern (Tennessee)
Donald G. Hay (Public Discussion), North Dakota Agricultural
Amos L. Herold (English), Tulsa
Earl L. Higgins (History), Arkansas State Teachers
Lawrence E. Hinkle (Modern Languages), North Carolina State
James A. Horton (History), Antioch
Walter M. Horton (Theology), Oberlin
Hubert C. Howard (English), West Virginia
H. Gordon Hullfish (Education), Ohio State
Henry C. Hutchins (English), Michigan
Frank C. Isely (Physics), Harvard
Oscar I. Janowsky (History), City of New York
Louis E. Johns (Music), Skidmore
John H. L. Johnstone (Physics), Dalhousie
Edward H. Jones (Mathematics), Southern Methodist
William E. Jones (Music), Texas State for Women
Herbert E. Jordan (Mathematics), Kansas
L. F. Kacmarynski (Commerce), St. Mary-of-the-Woods
Harriet H. Keith (Psychology), Hunter
Elsie R. Kengla (Education), Hunter
Carl W. Kinkeldey (German), City of New York
Adolf D. Klarmann (German), Pennsylvania
Frank E. Knowles (Physics), Phillips
John S. Kramer (History), Temple
William C. F. Krueger (Psychology), City of Detroit
Oscar N. Lackey (Physics, Chemistry), Arkansas State Teachers
Mary E. Larson (Zoology), Kansas
Paul Lawson (Entomology), Kansas
Umphrey Lee (Theology), Southern Methodist
Ben W. Lewis (Economics), Oberlin
Morris U. Lively (Bible, English), Centenary
Herbert G. Lull (Education), Kansas State Teachers (Emporia)
George A. Lundberg (Sociology), Pittsburgh
Laurence S. McLeod (Psychology), Tulsa
A. Wayne McMillen (Economics), Chicago
Helen O. Mahin (Journalism), Kansas
Clement T. Malan (Sociology), Indiana State Teachers
James A. Melrose (Philosophy, Psychology), James Milliken
Loren E. Messenger (Education), Southern Oregon Normal
J. B. Mitchell (Entomology), North Carolina State
Nina V. Mitchell (Education), Simpson
Rose L. Mooney (Physics), Tulane
Robert B. Morrissey (Physics), Massachusetts Institute of Technology
Raymond M. Mosher (Psychology), Idaho
Mildred Moulton (Political Science), Rutgers
Edwin D. Mouzon, Jr. (Mathematics), Southern Methodist
Francis C. Murgotten (Modern Languages), Nevada
James Naismith (Physical Education), Kansas

John H. Nelson (English), Kansas
Frederick G. Nichols (Education), Harvard
Luella S. Ninde (Home Economics), Cornell (Iowa)
Will V. Norris (Physics), Oregon
T. D. O'Brien, Jr. (History), New York
Lee-Carl Overstreet (Law), Missouri
Anthony Park (Law), Detroit
Samuel W. Patterson (Education), Hunter
Linus C. Pauling (Chemistry), California Institute of Technology
Theodore C. Pease (History), Illinois
Oscar J. Peterson (Mathematics), Kansas State Teachers (Emporia)
Robert B. Pettengill (Economics), Arizona
Howard S. Piquet (Economics), Princeton
Jesse Place (Biology), Texas
Mary L. Porter (Modern Languages), Meredith
Chesley J. Posey (Geography), Kansas
Rex Ragan (Accounting), Southern California
Albert G. Rau (History), Moravian
Frederic N. Raymond (Speech), Kansas
Walter Redford (Geography, Economics), Southern Oregon Normal
Earl A. Resweber (French), City of Detroit
R. L. Rhoads (Engineering), Wyoming
Marguerite L. Richards (French), Rutgers
Harry N. Rivlin (Education), City of New York
Graves B. Roberts (Romance Languages), Texas Agricultural and Mechanical
Dudley H. Robinson (Chemistry), California State Teachers
Elwood S. Roeder (Music), Mississippi Woman's
M. Wesley Roper (Sociology, Economics), Kansas State Teachers (Emporia)
Henry E. Schrammel (Psychology), Kansas State Teachers (Emporia)
Henry Schultz (Economics), Chicago
Florence I. Scoular (Home Economics), Purdue
Kenneth C. Sears (Law), Chicago
Ivan V. Shunk (Botany), North Carolina State
Bertha A. Smith (Physical Education), Southern Oregon Normal
Cyril E. Smith (History), Louisiana State
Dorothea E. Smith (Biology), Bryn Mawr
Fred C. Smith (Education), Harvard
Magdalen Soisson (Secretarial Science), Notre Dame
Francis T. Spaulding (Education), Harvard
Arpad Steiner (German), Hunter
Luke E. Steiner (Chemistry), Oberlin
Archie S. Stewart (English), Washington State
Smith L. Stovall (Engineering), California State Teachers
Robert Taft (Chemistry), Kansas
Elbert D. Thomas (History), Utah
Lowell C. Thompson (History), Arkansas State Teachers
E. Lee Treece (Bacteriology), Kansas
Clara A. Trotter (Education), Southern Oregon Normal

Austin H. Turney (Education), Kansas
George E. Vander Beke (Education), Marquette
Harold A. Van Dorn (Political Science), Rutgers
Ralph W. Veatch (Mathematics), Tulsa
J. H. Van Vleck (Physics), Wisconsin
M. Senn Waddell (Physics), Tulsa
Walter Wadepuhl (German), West Virginia
Ray E. Wakeley (Sociology), Iowa State
Julia G. Wales (English), Wisconsin
Charles A. R. Wardwell (Economics), Northwestern
Carl G. Watson (Physics), South Dakota State School of Mines
George F. Weida (Chemistry), William Jewell
Louis Weisner (Mathematics), Hunter
Emil Weiss (Bacteriology, Pathology), Loyola
B. W. Wells (Botany), North Carolina State
Wayne W. Wells (Biology), Southern Oregon Normal
Beulah D. Westerman (Chemistry), Florida State
Marie Whelan (Mathematics), Hunter
Blanche C. Williams (English), Hunter
P. L. Windsor (Library), Illinois
Calvert J. Winter (Spanish), Kansas
John H. Wittner (Physical Education), Union
Farris H. Woods (Zoology), Missouri
Orion D. Wray (Mathematics), Arkansas State Teachers
Austin Wright (English), Haverford
Adeline G. Wykes (Art), Hunter
Harry M. Zimmerman (Pathology), Yale

NOMINATIONS FOR JUNIOR MEMBERSHIP

Harold H. Anderson (Psychology), Iowa
Margaret Anderson (French), Rockford
Merle V. Baker (Geology), Ohio State
Mabel A. Barkley (Biology), Meredith
Hubert A. Bauer (Geography, German), Washington (Seattle)
Brewton Berry (Sociology), Missouri
Carroll D. Billmyer (Civil Engineering), Rhode Island State
Robert E. Blanc (English), Pennsylvania
Michael S. Blankfort (Psychology), Princeton
Ruth Bourne (History), Yale
Barclay W. Bradley (Classics), Occidental
William P. Brandon (Economics), North Carolina
Cora F. Braun (English), Cornell
Daniel J. Bronstein (Philosophy), Harvard
Eloise Buck (English), Southern Oregon Normal
Margaret A. Campbell (Chemistry), Vassar
William Chislett, Jr. (English), Albright
Mary Coggeshall (Biology), Johns Hopkins
William H. Combs (Political Science), Pennsylvania

Helen E. Crane (French), Oregon
John C. Davis (Economics), Michigan State
H. Gerald Dewees (Music), Northwestern
Susanna P. Edmondson (Romance Languages), Bryn Mawr
Alfred G. Ennis (Electrical Engineering), Massachusetts Institute of Technology
Leo B. Fagan (Speech), Iowa
Leona Fehler (History), Johns Hopkins
F. A. Fitch, Jr. (Physical Education), Marshall
Hazel M. Fletcher (Physics), Mt. Holyoke
Mina Goehring (Chemistry), Iowa
Norris W. Goldsmith (Physics), Cornell
William L. Greer (Geology), Wisconsin
Max L. Griffin (English, German), Tulane
O. A. Gullickson (Physical Education), Marshall
Danforth R. Hale (Chemistry), Cornell
Francis J. Haley (English), Harvard
Harvey C. Hansen (Education), Oklahoma
Stanley Hartsell (Bacteriology), Battle Creek
Charles C. Harvey (Classics), Hanover
B. F. Hastings (Engineering), Carnegie Institute of Technology
Benjamin H. Hill (Biology), Illinois
Arthur L. Hjortland (Zoology), Illinois
Lucile A. Huber (History), Columbia
William E. Hunter (Religion), Washington and Jefferson
A. Sidney Hyde (Zoology), Temple
Alice Irwin (Spanish), Northwestern
May H. James (Sociology), Harvard
Henry L. Jones (Education), George Peabody for Teachers
Harry J. Jordan (Economics), Missouri Valley
Arthur J. Klein (School Administration), Ohio State
Laurence J. Lafleur (Philosophy), Cornell
Robert S. Leonard (English), Harvard
Elmer L. Lucas (Geology), Oklahoma
Robert D. McGinnis (Economics), Ohio State
Mary K. Maner (Political Science), Columbia
Belle S. Matheson (English), Temple
George G. Mercer (Electrical Engineering), Lafayette
L. Gardner Miller (French), Rice
Vernon L. Miller (Psychology), Ohio State
William J. Miller (Speech), Minnesota
Nellie C. Morton (Mathematics), Brown
Sanford A. Mosk (Economics), California (Berkeley)
John Munroe (Education), Carleton
Pierrepont H. Nichols (English), Evansville
Leonard T. Nordlie (Economics), Chicago
Gerda Okerlund (English), Washington (Seattle)
Donald McL. Purdy (Psychology), Kansas
Oliver F. Ramsey (English), Texas
Orland M. Ritchie (Theology), Muskingum

Charles J. Rohr (History, Political Science), Trinity
N. W. Sawyer (English), Heidelberg
F. C. S. Schiller (Philosophy), Southern California
Gustav H. Schlauch (Education), Washington (Seattle)
Eleonora L. Schmidt (Anatomy), Oklahoma
John B. Schneider (Commerce), Marshall
Dwight L. Scoles (Chemistry), Columbia
James B. Sharp (Sociology), Stanford
Marjorie E. Stevenson (Classics), Hillsdale
Ruth W. Stokes (Mathematics), Duke
Harry J. Stuckey (Political Science), American
Leslie O. Taylor (Education), Minnesota
Richard V. Teggart (Economics), California (Berkeley)
Robert Warnock, Jr. (English), Pennsylvania
Isabel B. Watts (Botany), Arkansas
Harvey C. Webster (English), Michigan
Ernest A. Weinke (Education), Creighton
Hugo C. M. Wendel (History), New York
Francis W. Werking (Romance Languages), North Dakota Agricultural
Philip P. Wiener (Philosophy), Southern California
Philip B. Willauer (Political Science), Ursinus
Donald P. Wilson (Psychology), Florida
Harold F. Wilson (History), Columbia
J. S. Worrall (History), Ohio Wesleyan
Fred M. Zorbaugh (Sociology), Oberlin

SUPPLEMENTARY LIST OF NOMINATIONS FOR ACTIVE MEMBERSHIP

Joseph A. Ayers (English), Louisville
Leo E. Buss (Biology), Detroit
Paul L. Day (Chemistry), Arkansas
Richard S. Harter (Psychology), Temple
J. W. Hill (History), Emory and Henry
Alfred R. W. de Jonge (German), Detroit
Alvhh R. Lauer (Psychology), Iowa State
Daniel J. Maynihan (History), Detroit
Kenneth Scott (Classics), Western Reserve
Willis G. Swartz (Political Science), Southern Illinois State Normal
Arthur S. Taylor (Education), Southern Oregon Normal
J. Franklin Walker (Education), Arizona
S. M. Wedeberg (Business Administration), Maryland

SUPPLEMENTARY LIST OF NOMINATIONS FOR JUNIOR MEMBERSHIP

Eunice M. Acheson (Psychology), Columbia
Thomas A. Bendrat (Biology), Chicago
W. P. E. Hallensleben (German), Kalamazoo
Sidney C. Stone (Speech), Iowa State
Perry M. Teeple (Engineering), South Carolina

Appointment Service Announcements

The appointment service is open to members only. Those interested in keyed vacancies listed below may have duplicates of their registration blanks transmitted to appointing officers on request.

All correspondence should be addressed, Appointment Service, American Association of University Professors, 744 Jackson Place, Washington, D. C.

Vacancies Reported

Biology: Head of department, man, eastern university, appointment to be made during 1931-32. V 456

Librarian: Rank of associate professor or professor, man preferred, Pacific coast institution, beginning February or September, 1932. Library of approximately 68,000 volumes, 62,000 pamphlets, staff of three full-time assistants. Salary, \$3000, associate professor, \$4000 professor. V 436

Physician: Woman, substitute for college physician, small eastern woman's college, beginning February, 1932. V 358

Civil Service Announcements

Chemists: Four vacancies in Bureau of Mines for associate and assistant chemists, including industrial hygiene investigators, petrographers. Entrance salaries, \$2600-\$3800.

Entomologists: Vacancies in Department of Agriculture for associate entomologists qualified in blood-sucking Diptera, or any other specialized branches. Salaries, \$3200-\$3800.

Applications for the above positions must be on file with the U. S. Civil Service Commission, Washington, D. C., by December 30, 1931. Full information regarding the vacancies, together with application blanks, may be obtained from the Commission.

Teachers Available

Chemistry: Ph.D. 1925, six years' teaching experience. Prefers organic, physical, and general chemistry, with combination of teaching and research. A 201

Economics and Finance: Ph.D., nine years' teaching experience. Principal interest, teaching and personnel work. Qualified to teach corporation finance, money and banking, investments, business cycles, and economic theory. A 202

Education: Eleven years' teaching experience, secondary and college, now head of department in small college. Qualified to teach educational psychology, measurement, and supervise teacher training. Prefers location east of Mississippi. A 203

English: M.A. Northwestern; two years as fellow in English at U. of Chicago. Four years' teaching experience in state university, four years as department head in small college. World-wide travel and publications. Chief interest in creative writing. A 204

Mathematics: M.A. Harvard, Ph.D. Cornell. Nine years' teaching experience, European travel. Published articles besides the doctor's dissertation. Desires position with opportunity for scholastic development and graduate teaching if possible. A 205

Physics: S.B. from M. I. T. 1927, Sc.D. September, 1931. Specialty, theoretical physics. Desires position as instructor in physics. Available at once. A 206

THE MASSACHUSETTS
INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY
CAMBRIDGE, MASSACHUSETTS

offers

COURSES

in

AERONAUTICAL ENGINEERING	FUEL AND GAS ENGINEERING
ARCHITECTURE	GENERAL SCIENCE
ARCHITECTURAL ENGINEERING	GENERAL ENGINEERING
BIOLOGY AND PUBLIC HEALTH	GEOLOGY
BUILDING CONSTRUCTION	MATHEMATICS
BUSINESS AND ENGINEERING ADMINISTRATION	MECHANICAL ENGINEERING
CHEMICAL ENGINEERING	METALLURGY
CHEMICAL ENGINEERING PRACTICE	MINING ENGINEERING
CHEMISTRY	NAVAL ARCHITECTURE AND MARINE ENGINEERING
CIVIL ENGINEERING	PHYSICS
ELECTRICAL ENGINEERING	SANITARY ENGINEERING
ELECTROCHEMICAL ENGINEERING	

Leading to the degree of
Bachelor of Science

Also Graduate Courses leading to degrees of
Master of Science, Master in Architecture,
Doctor of Philosophy, Doctor of Science, and
Doctor of Public Health.

Correspondence should be addressed to the

Director of Admissions

Massachusetts Institute of Technology
Cambridge, Mass.

When writing to advertisers, please mention the Bulletin

McGraw-Hill

brings to your attention
a practical guide book in teaching

THE NATURE AND MEANING OF TEACHING

By Ralph F. Strebel

Assistant Professor of Education, Teachers College, Syracuse University

and Grover C. Morehart

Associate Professor of Education, Teachers College, Syracuse University

266 Pages, 5½ x 8, \$2.50

This book will be found to be a significant contribution in the field of interpretation of professional education.

It integrates closely the philosophy of education, the psychology of learning and the technique of teaching.

Throughout the book there is a rich variety of case illustrations and problems designed to tie up the stated principals to actual classroom situations.

The book not only discusses *what* the teacher is to do, but *why* he should do it and specifically *how* to accomplish the desired results.

Comments of Reviewers

"The newer conceptions of education are well presented and the mechanics of classroom teaching are clearly stated. The copious references for field study at the end of the chapters, together with the problems and exercises, and the graphic representation of a summary of the contents of each chapter, make the book a valuable contribution to the general stock of educational literature."

Industrial Arts Magazine

"*The Nature and Meaning of Teaching* by Strebel and Morehart is an unusually attractive general text in Education, suitable for either an introductory orientation course or for more advanced students. The material is comprehensive in organization and yet clear in presentation. It will prove a very helpful addition to the literature already available for young teachers and students of Education. It is the type of text that students like to handle and teachers want to own."

*Professor C. D. Champlin
Pennsylvania State College*

Send for a copy on approval

McGRAW-HILL BOOK COMPANY, Inc.

**370 Seventh Avenue
New York**

When writing to advertisers please mention the Bulletin.

The New York



University Press

From Maumee to Thames and Tiber: The Life-Story of an American Classical Scholar. By ERNEST G. SIHLER, PH.D., LITT.D., Professor Emeritus of the Latin Language and Literature, New York University.

The Lutherans of the Middle West, 1853-72; the Universities of Berlin and Leipzig, 1872-75; the Beginnings of Johns Hopkins, 1876-79; the Greek Club of New York; the Renaissance of New York University; Teaching, Travel, Research, and Publication.

8vo, xii + 270 pages. Portrait frontispiece; choicely printed by William Edwin Rudge. Bound in blue cloth; gold-lettered. Price \$5.00.

The Proverbs of Alfred. By HELEN P. SOUTH. \$4.00.

Chaucer's Constance and Accused Queens. By MARGARET SCHLAUCH. \$3.00.

James Shirley, Dramatist: A Biographical and Critical Study. By ARTHUR HUNTINGTON NASON. \$5.00.

Thomas Shadwell: His Life and Comedies. By ALBERT S. BORGMAN. \$5.00.

The Funeral Elegy and the Rise of English Romanticism. By JOHN W. DRAFER. \$6.50.

William Mason: A Study in Eighteenth-Century Culture. By JOHN W. DRAFER. \$6.50.

Alexander Dumas fils, Dramatist. By H. STANLEY SCHWARZ. \$4.00.

The General Problems of Psychology. By ROBERT MAC DOUGALL. \$5.00.

Logic and Nature. By MARIE C. SWABEY. \$4.00.

The Philosophy of the Abbé Bautain. By WALTER MARSHALL HORTON. \$5.00.

American Foreign Policies. By JAMES W. GARNER. \$6.00.

Sovereign States and Suits before Arbitral Tribunals and Courts of Justice. By JAMES BROWN SCOTT. \$6.00.

Representative Government. By WILLIAM HOWARD TAFT. \$5.00.

The Responsibility of States in International Law. By CLYDE EAGLETON. \$6.00.

A Treatise of Commerce. By John Wheeler, 1601. Edited by GEORGE BURTON HOTCHKISS. \$6.00.

Cavalier and Puritan: Ballads and Broad-sides Illustrating the Period of the Great Rebellion, 1640-1660. By HYDER E. ROLLINS. \$6.50.

The Pilgrim Fathers from a Dutch Point of View. By D. PLOOIJ. (*In preparation.*)

New England Leaders in the Colonial Period. By MARCUS W. JERNEGAN. (*In preparation.*)

The South as a Conscious Minority, 1789-1861. By JESSE T. CARPENTER. \$4.50.

The Parthenon: Its Science of Forms. By ROBERT W. GARDNER, A.I.A.

Originally arrived at by an inductive method, Mr. Gardner's findings were recently startlingly confirmed by a retranslation of a previously obscure passage in Plato's *Timaeus*. The elaborate hypotheses set forth in *The Parthenon* by the author appear now to be irrefutably proved, and the science of measurements used by the Greeks, their successors, and predecessors, is now available to the architect of today.

36 pages of printed matter and plates, 14 x 20 inches. Bound in board covers, gray cloth back, gray Roma sides; stamped in gold. Price \$15.00.

(Detailed circulars sent upon application)

THE NEW YORK UNIVERSITY PRESS
WASHINGTON SQUARE, EAST NEW YORK CITY

When writing to advertisers, please mention the Bulletin

APPOINTMENT SERVICE

Vacancies for the year 1932 will be announced during the coming months. Notices in the *Bulletin* will be of assistance to appointing officers and to candidates, who are invited to make announcements under Vacancies Reported or Teachers Available. Copy should be received by the 30th of the month preceding date of publication.

American Association of University Professors
744 Jackson Place
Washington, D. C.